Studies in Biblical and Ecclesiastical Subjects.

THE LATE DEAN CAMPBELL.

STUDIES

IN

BIBLICAL AND ECCLESIASTICAL SUBJECTS.

BY THE LATE

VERY REV. THEOPHILUS CAMPBELL, D.D.,

DEAN OF DROMORE.

EDITED BY HIS SON.

ST. THOMAS' PRIORY
LIBRARY
ROSS, CALIFORNIA

LONDON:
ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.
1895.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
INSPIRATION	1
THE SPECIAL DUTY OF THE CHURCH IN THIS LAND AS A WITNESS AND KEEPER OF HOLY WRIT	21
THE ROCK	31
THE COVENANT OBLIGATION OF THE LORD'S DAY	41
THE TRANSFIGURATION	62
'BY THE HAND OF A MEDIATOR'	74
'WE HAVE AN ALTAR'	85
HADES	102
'THE SPIRITS IN PRISON'—WHO WERE THEY?	119
UNIVERSALISM	134
EPISCOPACY SCRIPTURAL	152
THE CHURCH—WHAT IS IT?	173
BAPTISMAL REGENERATION	192
ST. PATRICK AND THE EARLY IRISH CHURCH	250

acc: 117

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/studiesinbiblica0000very

I. BIBLICAL PAPERS

INSPIRATION.

It cannot have escaped the observation of the most thoughtless, how much the Bible occupies the attention of men at the present day, how largely it enters into their discussions, and with what warmth various questions connected with it are debated. I speak now of the Bible as a book, not of its contents, its histories, its exhortations, its dogmas, its predictions; but simply of it as a book: its authority, its inspiration, its authenticity, its genuineness, its versions. Men of opposite views engage in the controversies, and with designs as opposite as their views. Some desirous to remove all doubt as to its Divine origin, to establish its genuine text, and to root the book itself more firmly in our affections, as the revelation to us of the will of our Heavenly Father. Others, anxious to dethrone it from its supremacy in our hearts, to weaken its authority, and to free us from the restraint of its principles and precepts — men of totally opposite sentiments, agreeing only in this, the attempt to disabuse our minds of their long cherished convictions. We cannot forget the saying of our Lord, 'Everyone that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved' (John iii. 20). So with many of these opponents, they would put out the light, this has always been the darling

object of the unbeliever. Unable to bear the light which exposed his deeds of darkness, no other course was open to him than to essay to put it out. Hence the world's enmity to our Lord; as He says to His brethren, 'The world cannot hate you; but Me it hateth, because I testify of it, that the works thereof are evil' (John vii. 7).

But, however powerful the enemy has been, yea, though he crucified the Lord Himself, the Bible has always triumphed in the end; and to-day it shines with all the quickening and reproving light its author has bestowed upon it. Always defeated, however, the enemy has not given up his purpose. He has only changed his tactics, and in these latter days he seeks by sapping and mining to accomplish his ends. He attacks the Inspiration of 'the holy writings,' and when he finds he cannot deny it altogether, he modifies it in various ways. We are told that part is inspired, part not; that inspiration does not necessarily imply infallibility; that the sentiments were inspired, not the words, and that the human element in the composition of the Scriptures necessitates imperfection; and that hence our reason must be exercised more or less to disentangle truth from human mistakes—mistakes, it is admitted, not of intention but of ignorance. It is to be regretted that with this last-named view some Christian men coincide.

A totally different objection is raised by others, an objection to full inspiration, the inspiration which keeps the writers from all error. It is said that the writers of the Bible were no more inspired than are all Christians. Certainly, all Christian men are inspired, for in fact, without inspiration no man can become or be a Christian. This is recognised fully in our Book of Common Prayer, in two collects: that for the fifth Sunday after Easter, and that at the opening of the Communion Service. The former prays thus, 'Grant to us, that by Thy holy inspiration we may think

those things that be good;' the latter, 'Cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of Thy Holy Spirit.' This is in full accord with our Lord's own teaching. Quoting the Old Testament He says: 'It is written in the prophets, And they shall be all taught of God. Every man therefore that hath heard and hath learned of the Father cometh unto Me' (John vi. 45). St. Paul writes, 'No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost' (1 Cor. xii. 3). Thus the united testimony of both Testaments is to the necessary inspiration of man by the Holy Ghost, in order that he may become Christian. And this is the only indelible and infallible mark of the true Christian man, whereby he is most certainly distinguished in God's sight from others who only bear the name of Christian. It is not a man's Church, nor his creed, nor his earnestness, nor his outward walk, nor his liberality that determines his Christianity; but solely that he is inspired by the Holy Ghost, taught of the Father by the inner teaching of the Holy Ghost to his soul. 'If any man have not the spirit of Christ he is none of His.' This objection proceeds on the assumption that the writers, as such, were inspired, to this I shall presently advert. It derives all its support from the measure of truth it contains.

An inspiration, however, of a totally different kind appertains only to those specially commissioned to make known at times the will of God to man. This is not a permanent endowment bestowed on man; it confers not character, and is irrespective of it; good men and bad men alike may be, and have been, its subjects. Yet, correctly speaking, this inspiration belongs not to the person, but to their communications. This is an important distinction, a distinction between inspired *writers* or *speakers*, and inspired *writings* or *utterances*. Of the latter alone the Bible speaks; 2 Tim. iii. 16, is here adduced solely to establish the statement, 'All Scripture

given by inspiration of God,' or 'is given by inspiration of God!' To my mind it is a matter of no moment in the controversy how the text is rendered, for we must in either case establish by textual criticism what is 'the Scripture.' And when we have satisfied ourselves in this matter, we can then say of the writing so ascertained to be holy Scripture, *It is given by inspiration of God.*

The text speaks not of inspired *writers*, but of inspired writing, πᾶσα γραφὴ, 'all Scripture.' In fact, inspired writers there were not. On the hypothesis that there were, all the objections to verbal inspiration are based. Such a writer, if such there were, could give no guarantee to us that he would not conceal or mistake his communications, unless the gift of inerrability as well as infallibility were bestowed on him. We know that Peter dissembled through fear and led others astray (Gal. ii. 14.) Hence Papal infallibility, if it exists, would be of no avail as an authority as long as it is admitted that the Pope may lie, and certainly he is not his superior, whom he erringly calls his predecessor in his See. If Peter dissembled when he had the right revealed to him, so may the Pope, and, like Peter, lead others astray. But Peter was not infallible, because he was not inspired; so neither is the Pope. The establishment of this point stops all controversy as to the nature of inspiration; it must be verbal.

Let me here give a few extracts from Dr. C. Wordsworth's lectures on 'The Inspiration of the Bible,' delivered in Westminster Abbey. He opens his first lecture with the declaration that, 'the hope of the Christian rests upon the belief that the Bible is the Word of God.' He says, 'By what reasons are we persuaded, and by what arguments would we seek to convince others, that the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible is the Word of God?' (p. 4).

'We are not of those who say, that though Holy

Scripture is inspired, it is marred and blemished by imperfections and inaccuracies.' He specifies various instances in which it is asserted that errors exist in the Scriptures, among them, 'St. Stephen's speech to the Hebrew Sanhedrim,' and says of all such, 'we cannot allow,—we cannot concede,—we cannot admit,—we cannot grant,—we cannot concur,' that is, that any errors, historical mistakes, or differences of narratives exist in the Bible. 'Writings which God the Holy Ghost dictated by their instrumentality are exempt from errors' (p. 14). 'We might not attribute the authority of the Scriptures to the *men* by whose instrumentality they were written, but to God, who wrote the Scriptures by their hands' (p. 82). 'This testimony extends to the whole Bible. It authenticates the whole as the inspired Word of God; it proves that *all Scripture*,—every part of Scripture,—is given by inspiration of God' (p. 102).

It will be seen that the inspiration of sentiments, or of facts, while the utterer or writer is left to his own choice of words, militates against the authority of the utterances, or writings; no matter how clearly a man may apprehend truth, no matter how perfect a master of language he may be, no matter how thoroughly honest, '*humanum est errare*': man is imperfect, and will err, and will misstate himself, or will state his ideas imperfectly; and the most that can be said of such a writer is, that he expresses his own view of things, and as such they will come to us with very little if any greater authority than his own. He can by no means call the statements 'the Word of God,' no man would allow this in his own case. He communicates, let us suppose, his ideas on a certain matter to a friend; he commissions him to make them known to others; but the friend clothing the ideas in his own words, the communication is not recognised by its author as his; it is his friend's word, and may, or may not, express correctly and fully the views as he originally

propounded them. Some of the opponents of verbal inspiration, seeing the force of this argument, have been compelled to admit that the writers of the Bible were preserved from verbal errors; but this militates against their own theory, being virtually verbal inspiration.

Others of those who hold the inspiration of sentiments, only deny this watchful and overruling providence; and, while asserting the existence of errors in the Bible (and I do not see how they can do otherwise on their theory), admit that no vital truth is imperilled by these errors, and that we can gather the truth from the imperfect writings of these imperfect men. One of these asserted errors is the use of unscientific language. For example, Joshua's command to sun and moon to stand still. The sun is said to move,—'run his course,'—and such like. Can anyone reasonably doubt that Joshua's was an inspired utterance? No man in his senses would venture of himself to give such a command to the heavenly bodies. Was Joshua a fool? Let it, however, be conceded that he used unscientific language, how does this trench on the theory of verbal inspiration? The Bible records the fact that he did so command, and in recording it wrote the truth. But is unscientific language employed? No, certainly not. 'The sun rises—sets,' is the language science always uses. How else could the facts be intelligently expressed? The language of science is the language of facts, phenomena are facts, and the language of science is the language of phenomena; the sun seems to rise, set, move, and astronomers say that he does what he appears to do. The Bible does the same, and if it did otherwise, it would be denounced as the work of a self-sufficient pedant. I have seen in a scientific work the day defined as a period of twenty-four hours; this is not a scientific definition; far from it. But dare one assume that the writer knew not that the earth revolves on her axis, and that the scientific

definition of a day is *a revolution of the earth on her axis*, whatever time the revolution may take to complete itself, be it twenty-four hours, or two, or a thousand?

But actual discrepancies are pointed out. The late Dean Alford, agreeing with the sentiment theory—may I call it the sentimental theory?—does not hesitate to speak of the discrepancies in the mere letter of the narrations of the feeding the five thousand. I had better give his words, as in his notes on John vi. 5: 'Here there is considerable difficulty, on account of the variation from Matthew, Mark, and Luke, who relate that the disciples came to the Lord after He had been teaching and healing the multitude, and when it was now evening—and asked Him to dismiss the multitude, that they might buy food; whereupon He commanded, "Give ye them to eat":—whereas, here, apparently, on their first coming, the Lord Himself suggests the question, How were they to be fed, to Philip. This difference is not to be passed over, as it has usually been by English commentators, without notice. Still less are we to invent improbable and hardly honest harmonistic shifts to piece the two narratives together. There can be no doubt, fairly and honestly speaking, that the narratives *in their mere letter*, disagree.' Now, 'fairly and honestly speaking,' and with all respect for the Dean's superior ability, there is great doubt of any disagreement between any two or more of the four narratives; and much less in the case specified. How, in the narrative, a transaction that took place at the beginning of the day could conflict with a transaction that occurred at its close baffles my poor comprehension. At the beginning of the day, as the multitude were coming towards Him, the Lord put a question to Philip; then follows a long day of teaching and healing, and at its close the disciples make a request of our Lord. In the morning the Lord asks, 'Whence shall we buy bread, that these may eat?' Philip answered Him, 'Two

hundred pennyworth of bread is not sufficient for them that everyone of them may take a little.' In the evening the disciples request the Lord to send the people away to buy bread. Jesus answers, 'They need not depart; give ye them to eat.' They reply, repeating the words of Philip in the morning, 'Shall we go and buy two hundred pennyworth of bread, and give them to eat?' In all this where is there even the shadow of a ground for the very decided declaration that disagreement exists, and for the strong language used by the Dean towards those who do not happen to see any difference in the narratives? The fact is, the Dean held an untenable theory of inspiration, and fancied he here saw an argument in its favour: and through the glasses of that theory he saw a difference which else could not be seen.

Influenced by these remarks of the learned Dean, I carefully examined the four records, and rose from the study struck with wonder and admiration at the perfect dovetailing of the four into one harmonious narrative—so perfect as to be to me one of the most convincing proofs that one mind composed the four accounts, which the pens of the Evangelists committed to writing in the words of that Being who is the Author of all. No four men, left to the choice of their own words, could possibly have written four narratives of the same event, each omitting some details supplied by the others—some by one, some by another—narratives in which no piece requires to be cut or planed to make it fit into its place. And if these 'ignorant and unlearned men,' getting their information from different sources, wrote on the theory maintained by the Dean, we have a miracle before which the resurrection of Lazarus from corruption must pale.

From these narratives I must deduce another proof of verbal inspiration. I do not adduce these as other than indirect proofs, but not the less powerful, if not indeed more so, than any direct and formal ones, as without

verbal inspiration such could not be; it is not in the nature of things.

In his account of the miracle, St. Matthew relates that there were present 'about five thousand ἄνδρες—males—beside women and children' (xiv. 21). He alone mentions the women and children as being present. But, with the accuracy that could, under the circumstances, belong only to Him who knows all things, do Mark, Luke, and John informs us that those who were fed were 'about five thousand ἄνδρες—males.' Not one uses the more natural word, ἀνθρώπος, including both sexes and the children. More natural for those who were not present, as Mark and Luke, and who, with John, make no mention of women and children. Had ἀνθρώπος appeared in any narrative, there would have been a discrepancy, of which the Dean of Canterbury would not have been slow to take advantage. This agreement is the more remarkable, as our Lord uses the more general word in the command, 'Make the people—ἀνθρώπους—sit down,' as St. Mark paraphrases it, 'Make all—men, women, and children—sit down;' while St. John records that 'the ἄνδρες sat down in number about five thousand.'

But how are we to account for the discrepancies which do undoubtedly appear in codices and versions of the Bible? What about interpolations, omissions, and additions? What, I ask, in return, have these to do with the question of inspiration? They belong to the domain of criticism. It has been the fashion to confound these totally distinct domains. So does the Dean of Canterbury *ad infinitum*. Inspiration has nothing to do with codices and versions, any more than with quotations; it is concerned only with the original documents; and it is in reference to these we maintain verbal inspiration. If I write a letter to a friend, and if that letter be copied by different persons, and in these copies various discrepancies appear, will it be seriously argued that my original letter

did not contain my own words? Unless, then, we had the originals before us, of 2 Samuel and 1 Chronicles, we are not justified in saying there is a discrepancy in the statements of the numbers of the people as taken in the census made by Joab. This and similar differences do not militate in the least against the verbal inspiration of the original documents. The sayings of men are sometimes appealed to with an air of triumph as impossible to have been inspired. We reply, the sayings and doings of good men and of bad are written in the Bible with fidelity, but I am not aware that anyone ever made the mistake of maintaining that all these sayings and doings, even of good men, were said or done under the influence of inspiration. But we maintain that the record of them was so written.

It is said that a mechanical, or verbal, inspiration destroys altogether the human element in the composition of the Bible. Why? What is the human element? Has this been defined and decided? Different persons no doubt have different ideas of its nature. Before stating my own opinion, I must advert to another matter which is not by some sufficiently apprehended. I mean the sources of information. We must keep this distinct from inspiration. Sometimes the writers received their information from personal observation; sometimes from the report of others; sometimes from direct revelation, including visions. Sometimes the writers had no information at all on the subjects of their writings. Thus Matthew and John had had personal intercourse with our Lord; Mark, some suppose, was taught by St. Peter; and Luke says that he had traced up everything to the beginning; and St. Paul expressly claims direct revelation as the source of his knowledge of the life of our Lord (Gal. i. 11, 12); but, however acquired, the committal of that knowledge to writing was by inspiration; and much that was not understood by the writer was at

times included in his communication. Thus St. Peter says, 'Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you; searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow' (1 Pet. i. 10, 11). After the revelation to them, they sat down—may I say? using the language of the present day — to search the Scripture, and they searched and sought earnestly to discover the bearing of what they had foretold.

The prophet Daniel declares of himself at the close of the vision granted to him, 'I heard, but I understood not'; and he was informed that such understanding was withheld until the time of the end drew nigh (xii. 8, 9).

The case of Balaam will be considered by-and-by.

Now, what is the human element in the utterances or writings of inspiration? Not the writer's understanding of the matter of his communications, not the man's natural ability to express himself with accuracy, but this: God did not expressly create human speech for the purpose of His communications to men; but when He willed to make His mind known to them, He adopted the mode He had bestowed on them at their creation for the purposes of their existence here. He employed their language, as used among and by themselves. He employed, so to speak, the natural and rational mode. When He called the herdman from the herd to be His prophet, He put into that prophet's mouth the words of the herdman; when He selected the learned and aristocrat Saul of Tarsus, He employed the language of the man of learning, the argumentation of the learned man; and thus in all the Scriptures appear the peculiarities of human composition and communication of ideas by man to man, save only error. Had it been otherwise, had the Bible been written in one style throughout, had

it been unnatural, had the language of the learned been put into the lips of the unlearned, or *vice versâ*, no stronger evidence of collusion between the writers could have been adduced; indeed one that could not have been met. It seems, oddly enough, to be assumed that God has a style of His own—a style of writing and of speaking; and that, if verbal inspiration be admitted, that Divine style must characterize the Bible from cover to cover.

In his Prolegomena to the Gospels, Dean Alford thus writes: 'I do not hesitate to say that, being thus applied, its effect (verbal inspiration) will be to destroy altogether the credibility of our Evangelists. . . . To cite only one obvious instance, *the title over the Cross* was written in Greek. According, then, to the verbal inspiration theory, each Evangelist has recorded the *exact words* of the inscription, not the *general sense*, but the inscription itself—not a letter less or more. This is absolutely necessary to the theory. Its advocates must not be allowed, with inconvenient inconsistency, to take refuge in a common-sense view of the matter, whenever their theory fails them, and still to uphold it in the main.' This statement of the theory is so ludicrously incorrect, that I can impute its erroneousness only to the exigency of system. I confess my inability altogether to see how God, giving the general sense of the inscription on four different occasions, was compelled to use on each occasion the same words, and no others—'not a letter less or more'; and that if a different form of words were employed on each occasion by Him, therefore, He could not have written them at all! We maintain that God gave this general sense in three or four different forms, each time in the words He considered most suitable for His purpose. Would the Dean wish his writings to be treated after his own rule? He writes to four friends 'the general sense' of some fact, or opinion, and to each friend he varies the words in which he expresses himself. What

would he say to the 'common-sense' of the man who, having before him these four communications, should declare that the variety of expression destroyed altogether the credibility of the Dean?

And in these differences do we not see the human element as I have defined it? If four persons, of ordinary powers of accuracy, desirous to give a true recital of events, were writing each his account of the Crucifixion, is not the presumption that they would give the exact words of the Superscription? How much more four men of whom the Dean writes thus: 'The inspiration of the sacred writers I believe to have consisted in the fulness of the influence of the Holy Spirit, specially raising them to, and enabling them for their work, *in a manner which distinguishes them from all other writers in the world, and their work from all other works.* The men were full of the Holy Ghost, the books are the pouring-out of that fulness through the men—the conservation of the treasures in earthen vessels' (Prolegomena). Again: 'We can understand that the fountains of thought might be Divinely purified, and the higher faculties strengthened, in order that they might worthily and nobly put forth the knowledge imparted from God. We can understand, as the result of such a special inspiration of the writers, works which shall be distinct in their character from all mere human works.' (Review of Rev. E. Garbett's 'God's Word Written,' in the *Contemporary Review* for February, 1867.) From such men should we not expect accuracy of detail excluding all mistakes? Yet, while so different from all others, in one important respect, and that the only one that gives authority to their writings, they were not raised above other men; they were liable to err, and they did err—'real discrepancies,' says the Dean, exist in their narratives.

On the theory I am upholding there is but one Author of the four Gospels, although the pen was held by four

different hands; and He deemed it right, in His wisdom, to vary the form in which He recorded the inscription over the Cross. How is this calculated to destroy the credibility of the Gospels? On the contrary, it establishes it.

I have not yet done with the Dean. Confounding inspiration with criticism, he adduces another objection to the verbal inspiration of the original documents, thus: 'If it be so, the Christian world is left in uncertainty what her Scriptures are, as long as the sacred text is full of various readings.' Does not this militate against any Bible at all, even on the Dean's own theory? If the existence of various readings at the present day disproves verbal inspiration, does it not equally disprove plenary inspiration, or any, even the lowest, view of it that can be taken? Are we not left in uncertainty as to what are our sacred Scriptures, on any hypothesis? Again he says, 'And, which is equally subversive of the theory, though not of equal importance in itself, there is hardly a sentence in the whole of the Gospels in which there are not varieties of diction in our principal MSS., baffling all attempts to decide what was its original form.' Does the Dean mean to say (he says it plainly enough) that, because copyists have miscopied—altering, or omitting, or interpolating—therefore, the original form was not correct, not verbally inspired? or, in fact, that there was no original form at all? So that, if a number of men should, consciously or unconsciously, misquote the Dean's Prolegomena, therefore the Dean did not write it, or that it was full of errors, or that it never existed, or some equally strange conclusion.

On the subject of translations I wish to say a few words, as in connection with this the question is often asked, with a kind of triumphant self-complacency, Can you say that the English version, with all its imperfections, is the veritable Word of God? No one that I

am aware of ventures to make such assertion: but this is said, and said truly, 'It is to me the Word of God'; and by this is meant that, in so far as it truly represents the original, it is the Word of God. If our Lord spoke in Greek when He said, 'ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ὁδὸς καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ ἡ ζωή,' since the English rendering, 'I am the way, and the truth, and the life,' fully represents the original, it is as much the Word of Christ as is the original Greek. We have a striking illustration of this in Hebrews x. 5. Here we have a quotation from Psalm xl. 6. In the former the words are, 'a body hast Thou prepared me'; but in the Psalm, 'mine ears hast Thou opened.' The words in the Hebrews are the rendering of the LXX., but are quoted by the writer of the epistle as the very words of our Lord Himself, spoken by anticipation in prophecy. Why this? Because the translation fully represents the sense of the original, and conveys to Gentile readers the import, which the Hebrew form would not have done. It is, therefore, altogether beside the question to start this objection to the verbal inspiration of the original documents.

The Bible is the Word of God. So it speaks of itself. In this manner David describes the inspiration of his utterances: 'The Spirit of God spake by me, and His word was in my tongue' (2 Sam. xxiii. 2). Similarly, in the New Testament, thus our Lord says, 'David himself said by the Holy Ghost' (Matt. xii. 36). In Acts i. 16, we have 'the Holy Ghost by the mouth of David spake.' In chap. iv. 35, (God) 'who by the mouth of Thy servant David hast said.' In Hebrews iii. 7, this formula in quoting Scripture occurs, 'as the Holy Ghost saith.' In chapter iv. 3, 5, there is a quotation from Genesis ii. 2, from Moses' narrative of the institution of the Sabbath; and though Moses' words, yet quoted as God's words, the *ipsissima verba* of Him who said, 'if they shall enter into My rest,' the whole passage is instructive: 'We which have

believed do enter into rest: as He said, As I have sworn in My wrath, if they shall enter into My rest; although the works were finished from the foundation of the world. For he spake in a certain place of the seventh day on this wise, And God did rest the seventh day from all His works. And in this place again, If they shall enter into My rest.' Throughout this quotation the 'He' is God the Holy Ghost; and it is said He spake—wrote—the passage in Genesis that is quoted. With equal propriety might we quote any verse of the record of creation, and say, 'He,—God,—spake;' not Moses.

Once more. St. Paul declares that he spake the things of God 'not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth' (1 Cor. ii. 13). Here the two theories of inspiration are virtually contrasted, that of sentiments, thoughts, facts, revelations, with choice of words as dictated by man's judgment or wisdom; and that of the words taught, inspired by the Holy Ghost. The latter is that claimed by the Apostle, the former is repudiated by him.

St. Peter's testimony to the inspiration of the Old Testament is complete. He writes (2nd Epistle i. 20, 21): 'No prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation, for the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.' Here are the proposition and the reason which establishes it. The proposition is, that no man is permitted to put his own interpretation upon any prophecy of Scripture; and the reason assigned is, that man's will had nothing to do with its origin or utterance, for the prophets spake—the words dropped from their lips as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. Had the will of man aught to do with the utterance, then the will of man might be exercised in the interpretation; but the words being the words of the Holy Ghost, are to be taken in the simplicity of their meaning, with-

out hesitation or doubt, or the exercise of any human ingenuity to disentangle the truth from (as some say) the erroneous expressions in which it is, sometimes at least, conveyed. They are God's own utterances, as distinguished from man's.

What is prophecy? It is not identical with prediction. Prophecy is the revelation of God's will concerning any matter. And, in the words of God, as dictated by the Holy Ghost, the case of Moses and Aaron furnishes an illustration of this. Moses declined to go and speak unto the Israelites, because he was 'slow of speech.' 'And the Lord said unto him, Who made man's mouth: have not I, the Lord? Now, therefore, go, and I will be with thy mouth, and teach thee what thou shalt say.' Moses still hesitating, the Lord informs him that his brother Aaron is coming to meet him, adding, 'Thou shalt speak unto him, and put words into his mouth, and he shall be thy spokesman unto the people, and he shall be, even he shall be to thee instead of a mouth, and thou shalt be to him instead of God.' And again, 'See, I have made thee a god to Pharaoh, and Aaron thy brother shall be thy prophet' (Exod. iv. 11, 15, 16; vii. 1).

Now look at Peter's declaration in the light thus thrown upon it. Do we not see that the prophet of God is only God's spokesman, uttering the words put by God into his mouth? Thus the whole Old Testament Scripture is included in St. Peter's 'prophecy which came not of old time by the will of man, but which holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.' These holy men of God were not gifted with a permanently-abiding endowment, by which they should speak without error at all times what they conceived to be God's will; but ever and anon they spake as the Holy Ghost impelled them, as a vessel is moved onwards in her course by a favouring wind.

The case of Nathan, David's seer, is in point. David

expressed to him his intention to build a house to the Lord, and Nathan said in reply: 'Go, do all that is in thy heart, for the Lord is with thee.' This was not the mind of God, therefore He moved the prophet; the word of God came unto him, and he went next morning to David to tell him that not he, but his son, was to build the house unto God (2 Sam. vii.).

One more remarkable instance remains to be considered as completing the Bible's own testimony to the character of its inspiration. I refer to the case of Balaam, who was a prophet of the Lord; that is, one by whose mouth the Lord at times made known His will. Who would designate him an inspired man? A few verses will impress our minds with a clear conviction of what an inspired utterance is. God's command to the prophet was as follows: 'The word which I shall say unto thee, that shalt thou do' (Numb. xxii. 20). This was repeated: 'Go with the men; but only the word that I shall speak unto thee, that thou shalt speak' (verse 35). When, then, Balak met the prophet he received this intimation, 'Lo, I am come unto thee: have I now any power at all to say anything? the word that God putteth in my mouth that shall I speak' (verse 38). The wretched man, coveting the rewards of unrighteousness, felt at the same time his inability to say aught of his own mind. Compelled to bless, when he longed to curse, he incurred the blame of his patron, yet he could but say in justification of his conduct: 'Must I not take heed to speak that which the Lord hath put in my mouth?' (xxiii. 12.) After his second prophecy, being again censured, he pleads still his inability to comply with Balak's wishes: 'Told I not thee, saying, All that the Lord speaketh that I must do?' (verse 26.) Once again, and more fully: 'If Balak would give me his house full of silver and gold, I cannot go beyond the commandment of the Lord, to do either good or bad of

mine own mind; but what the Lord saith, that will I speak' (xxiv. 13). When we add to this the statement repeated, 'The Lord put a word in Balaam's mouth' (xxiii. 5, 16), we can clearly see how mechanical was the prophesying of this wicked man. The whole desire of Balaam's heart was to curse; he could not but bless, for the word of blessing was put in his mouth, and the Holy Ghost moved him so to speak. But when this was past, and he was no longer under the moving influence of God, he gave to Balak the sad advice which led to the ruin of so many. We must not overlook the 'dumb ass speaking with man's voice.' He was God's prophet to Balaam, to rebuke him for his iniquity. Scoffingly is this incident referred to by the unbeliever, and the notion of an 'inspired ass' jeered at, and justly, but no such thing was there—the ass was but the instrument, the rebuke was God's; the utterance was inspired, the words were the words of God by the mouth of the ass. It is folly to talk of the mind of the ass having been concerned; but the formula of inspiration is in the narrative: 'The Lord opened the mouth of the ass, and she said' (xxii. 28). Whether, then, in relation to matters past, present, or to come—matters of history or dogma, instruction or prediction—nothing is inspired, nothing the word of God, which is not thus spoken, or written, as God the Holy Ghost moves the tongue or the pen of the agent; and this alike the case, whether the burden of the inspiration be things known or unknown to the person so moved to speak or write. 'I cannot go beyond the commandment of the Lord to do either good or bad of mine own mind.'

What is our conclusion? Either the whole Bible is inspired, or none of it; either every word, or not one. If we deny the inspiration of the words; if we assert they are but the words of man's wisdom—fallible man's wisdom—where is our security that they reveal to us the

truth which sanctifies and saves? They who subject the Word of God to the decisions of what they term the verifying faculty of reason, may well fail in correct apprehension of the inspiration of the sacred Scriptures. But they who, as saith the prophet, 'tremble at God's word' (Isa. lxvi. 5), will own the inspiration of every part, feeling that it is the inspiration of the whole which imparts to the Bible its supreme authority, and which renders it a fearful thing to withhold our faith and obedience from any part of it. 'Thus saith the Lord, Whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear.' 'The word which I have spoken, the same shall judge him at the last day.'

The Bible is the Word of God; the words of the Bible are the words of God; therefore with confidence we rely on them, bind their promises to our heart, enjoy peace with God through the glad tidings revealed by them, and say of every word (and feel it too), 'It is my Father's voice, I must, I will obey.'

THE SPECIAL DUTY OF THE CHURCH IN THIS LAND AS A WITNESS AND KEEPER OF HOLY WRIT.

This question assumes, first, that there is a 'Holy Writ'; second, that the Church is 'a witness and keeper' of that Holy Writ; third, that a special duty devolves on the Church in this land as such witness and keeper. It might seem as if these were self-evident truths—axioms about which there could be no dispute among professing Christians. But is it so? I would to God it were. That it is not so is too patent if we only cursorily cast our eyes over the broadcast literature of the day. In this in a thousand different ways is it, sometimes openly, sometimes more guardedly, asserted, and essayed to be established, that there are no writings to which peculiarly the designation 'holy' should be attached; that, in fact, 'the Holy Bible' is a misnomer, as there are other writings, the writings of even pagan philosophers, as well as of 'wise men' in all ages, including our own days, to which as justly the title may be given. Need I delay to prove that there is at the present day—I might say there has been in all ages—what may be called a conspiracy against the Bible, of men of very opposite systems, men between whom enmity exists as great as that which separated Herod and Pontius Pilate of old, but who shake hands over, if they can by fair means or by foul accomplish it, the overthrow of the Bible? I never read any of these

attacks without detecting misquotation, misinterpretation, and misapplication, and feeling that, if these men were subjected to a school-child's examination, they would exhibit lamentable ignorance of the Book which they are trying to dethrone from its supremacy in our hearts.

Perhaps there are those here who are not aware of what is in progress among us. Nothing less than the revival of the ancient pagan and Buddhistic philosophy and atheism, with all the abominations of the mysteries of Babylon and Egypt, and the obscene worship which was offered to their symbols—a worship so frequently denounced as an abomination in the sight of God in communion with the Asherim (the 'groves' of the A.V.). It is openly declared—I quote from a recent publication—'the religion of the ancients is the religion of the future,' and towards the bringing this to pass a flood of Spiritualistic and Theosophic literature is sweeping over Christendom, of which few have any cognizance. There is now before me a publisher's catalogue, containing the names of seventy-six works of, as described, 'the literature of Occultism and Archæology,' that might well make us stand aghast.

The enemy is upon us. What are we doing? Virtually opening our ranks and letting him in. There are those who have conceded to him this, that the history of the Bible, and especially of the Pentateuch, and still more especially of the early portion of Genesis, is not history, but a myth, or a legend, or an allegory, or a fable—in plain words, that it is not true. And this despite our Lord's own references and quotations. It is asserted that Moses did not write the five books. Yet our Lord quoted from them as the writings of Moses—'If they believe not his' (Moses') 'writings'; 'They have Moses and the prophets'; and still more unmistakably, 'Moses wrote of Me.' Was our Lord ignorant or mistaken? Oh no! But He used the current language of the day, it is replied,

that is, He stereotyped a very serious error, a positive untruth, which has deceived His Church to the present day. If He said, 'Moses wrote of Me,' when Moses did not write a single line concerning Him, how can we reconcile this with that brightest trait in His peerless character, 'guile was not found in His mouth'? Not only did our Lord thus seal with His authority the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, but every writer of the Bible who referred to it similarly recognised this authorship. Let us examine one important instance, the well-known difficulty of the Sadducees concerning the resurrection in the case of the woman who had had seven husbands. Jesus, in His reply, imputed their error to their ignorance of the Scriptures. 'Ye do greatly err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God.' He quotes from Exodus as touching the resurrection of the dead: 'Have ye not read that which was spoken to you by God?' In Mark it is, 'Have ye not read in the book of Moses?' In Luke, 'That the dead are raised Moses showed at the bush.' It is to be noted that here the Pentateuch has three designations—'Scripture,' 'spoken by God' (*i.e.*, 'the Word of God'), and 'the book of Moses'; thus identifying all, and as of paramount authority.

It is essential that we have a clear, distinct and definite conception of the Scriptures—the Holy Writ of our subject. What are they? In a meeting of clergymen of the Church of Ireland it ought not to be necessary even to propose, much less at any length to answer, such a question. Indeed, the Church's own answer is complete. 'In the name of Holy Scripture we do understand those canonical books of the Old and New Testament of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church.' The titles of the books are specified. These constitute the one Book which the Church calls 'the Bible' and 'God's Word written.' The candidate for Holy Orders in the

Church has to declare his acceptance of this definition as correct, and then, subsequently, kneeling before the ordaining Bishop, as God's officer, who, in the words of the rubric, is directed to 'deliver into his hand the Bible,' and to confer on him 'authority to preach the Word of God'—solemnly to covenant to preach that Word, the Bible given and received being, like the ring in the marriage ceremony, 'a token and pledge of the vow and covenant' thus made.

We must not pass by without note the significant fact that the Church in this service designates the Bible 'the Word of God.' There is a milk-and-water expression that timid men sometimes have recourse to when afraid to stand out boldly before the world and do battle for the Bible as the Word of God. They say 'the Bible contains the Word of God.' If this be so, who is to decide what is and what is not of that Word? Is the land-grabbing peasant who desires his landlord's property to decide for himself that 'thou shalt not steal' and 'thou shalt not covet' are not part of the Word of God? And if not, why not?

Do we really know what we are doing when we make, and act upon, this statement? The only offensive weapon our Leader has put into our hands to use in our warfare with the enemy is 'the Sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God.' Shall we blunt its edge before we strike? For this we do effectually when we lower the authority of any one portion of that Book, as not being of God. And we act unfaithfully to the Church which has spoken with no uncertain utterance, as I have clearly showed.

This leads us naturally to the subject of inspiration, for it is on inspiration that authority rests, and to assert that the Bible is the Word of God is virtually to assert the inspiration of the whole, and I will go further and say, to assert even its verbal inspiration. From this some good men shrink at the present day; but they do so because

they confound criticism with inspiration, and these are totally different domains. Further, they do not see that to lower the character of the inspiration is to lower the authority of the Book. I would ask those friends who differ from me this simple question, Could the writers of the Bible in their writings for our learning have made mistakes? If the answer is in the negative, verbal inspiration is at once virtually admitted. If the answer is in the affirmative, then we must deal with the Bible as with the writings of other men, as on no higher level, and accept or reject its teaching according to our judgment or fancy; and the Bible is not to us 'the Word of God.'

A mistake is frequently made in this matter: the writers are designated 'inspired.' Now this is to attribute to them the endowments of infallibility and inerrability, so that, under all circumstances and at all times, their utterances were infallibly true, no error whatever mingling with them. This is not the Scripture view. It speaks of inspired *writings*, not *writers*—inspired as often as the Spirit of God came upon the prophet, and then it was, as Balaam said, 'Have I now any power at all to say anything? The word that God putteth in my mouth that shall I speak.' And when—shall I call it the Divine afflatus?—when it ceased to influence, the utterer or writer was no more than any other man, until again the Spirit spake by him. This is the teaching of St. Peter (2 Epis. i. 21), 'impelled by the Holy Ghost men from God spake.'

St. Paul claims verbal inspiration for his teaching. In 1 Corinthians ii. he asserts that by revelation to himself he was instructed in the deep things of the wisdom of God. 'God,' he says, 'hath revealed them unto us by His Spirit.' He repudiates the idea that he 'came with excellency of speech, or of wisdom, declaring the mystery of God.' 'My speech,' he adds, 'and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom'; and more

fully still, 'Which things also we speak, not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Spirit teacheth'—the words themselves taught by the Spirit.

With another statement of St. Paul I must deal more fully, both because of its vital importance, and of the way in which the R.V. has treated it—2 Timothy iii. 16. (I give it first in the original), *πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος καὶ ὠφέλιμος*. A schoolboy's knowledge would tell him intuitively that here *πᾶσα γραφὴ* is the subject, and *θεόπνευστος καὶ ὠφέλιμος* the predicate. But not so the revisers. They have not hesitated to divide the predicate, and to read *πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος* as the subject, and *καὶ ὠφέλιμος* as the predicate. There is no verb. The A.V. translates, 'All Scripture *is* given by inspiration of God, and *is* profitable.' The R.V. reads, 'Every Scripture inspired of God *is* also profitable.' However, there is a marginal reading, 'Every Scripture *is* inspired of God, and profitable.' I shall not say that the text of the R.V. is absurd; it is nonsensical. If 'every Scripture inspired of God' is the subject, then the predicate is imperfect, and to make sense would require the insertion of another adjective, and to be read thus, 'Every Scripture inspired of God is'—something, whatever adjective we insert—'and profitable.'

The construction of the sentence is peculiar; there are but few similar instances to be found. It has been asserted that there are none in the Classics. We have two in the Epistle to the Hebrews. How did the revisers deal with them? We shall see. Chapter iv. 13: *πάντα δὲ γυμνὰ καὶ τετραχηλισμένα*. Here we have the subject *πάντα* answering to *πᾶσα γραφὴ*, and two adjectives joined by the copulative, as in the other sentence the predicate. Both A.V. and R.V. insert the verb after *πάντα*, and translate, 'All things are naked and opened (or laid open).' Had the revisers followed their precedent in 2 Timothy, they would have translated thus: 'All naked things are also

laid open,' the nonsense of which would have been at once perceived. In another respect the revisers have not dealt fairly with the two passages. In Timothy the verb is printed in italics, but in Hebrews iv. in roman type; the ordinary English reader is thus prevented from suspecting a similarity of construction. In the A.V. the verb in this passage is in italics. Can there be mere oversight here?

The other instance is Hebrews xiii. 8: 'Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever.' There is no verb; none is inserted in the A.V., but in the R.V. it is inserted in italics after 'Jesus Christ.' Translate this verse after the revisers' rule in Timothy, and we should have, 'Jesus Christ yesterday and to-day, the same *is* also forever.'

What led the revisers to treat this important testimony to the inspiration of the Old Testament Canon in this foolish and unscholarly manner? They evidently followed the translation suggested, I think, by Dr. Pye-Smith, who, having imagined that the whole Old Testament Canon could not have been inspired, was met by St. Paul's statement in 2 Timothy. He knew that γραφὴ was a technical word for the Old Testament, and the plain declaration πᾶσα γραφὴ standing in the way of his theory, he set it aside by dividing the predicate, and making nonsense of the passage.

In another form we have the full inspiration of the Old Testament Scriptures no less asserted. St. Paul specifies as the chief advantage of circumcision that the oracles of God, τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ, were entrusted to their keeping —*Τὰ* λόγια, the Divine responses of the priests or priestesses of the heathen deities when they were under the afflatus of the god, so that the responses were not the words of the agent, but of him or her who influenced and compelled them. Stephen uses the words λόγια ζῶντα—living, life-giving oracles. St. Peter enjoins ministers to 'speak as

the oracles of God'—speak God's words, God's teaching. The important bearing of this word λόγια applied to the Scriptures is evident, as settling the character of their inspiration. 'Holy Writ' is, then, 'the Bible,' and 'the Bible is the Word of God;' and this, according to the testimony of the Scriptures themselves, and the judgment of the Church of which we are ministers. I may here quote a passage from Dr. Pusey's preface to his 'Lectures on Daniel': 'This has been, for some thirty years, a deep conviction of my soul, that no book can be written in behalf of the Bible like the Bible itself. Man's defences are man's word; they may help to beat off attacks, they may draw out some portion of its meaning. The Bible is God's Word, and through it God the Holy Ghost, who spoke it, speaks to the soul which closes not itself against it.'

What is our special duty—is not our special our general duty also?—as the witness and keeper of Holy Writ? Is it not to bear full, explicit, uncompromising testimony to the Book, as in all its parts God's revelation of truth to us? And this despite the ridicule of science, falsely so called. We have to encounter revived pagan philosophy and religion; we have to contend against spiritualism, theosophy, occultism, even Buddhism, whose forces are all combined against the Bible; and, to come more specially to our own land, against Romanism, the most subtle of all the Bible's foes, combining, as it does, more or less in itself, all the evils of a christened paganism, combined with a philosophic atheism. How are we to meet this with any prospect of success? I confess I know not, otherwise than we have been doing through our existing societies. Can we calculate on reaching more than a comparatively few individual cases? Satan seems to me to have surrounded the Romanists of Ireland with a wall of iron, high and broad, which we cannot surmount. It is our duty, however, by every

means in our power to assail it whenever God in His providence may open up the way, but to assail with that only weapon which He has given us to keep, 'Holy Writ.' We must keep it—keep it whole and undefiled; not suffer one book, one chapter, nay, one verse, of all that just and learned criticism may decide for us as originally belonging to the documents as they came from the hands of their writers to be filched away from it. We should ever remember that, notwithstanding all the corruptions in the Old Testament Scriptures, arising from interpolations and omissions, the mistakes of transcribers or the perversions of enemies, the testimony of the New Testament is unvarying, that these Scriptures were given by inspiration of God, were God's oracles, and were quoted by our Lord, by Evangelists, and by Apostles as the Scripture which cannot be broken.

How is this responsible duty pressed upon us by St. Paul when in 1 Timothy iii. he designates the Church as 'the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground [or basement] of the truth?' The basement on which rests the column bearing as its inscription the truth, for all to read, thus the witness and keeper of the truth. As Jehovah addresses the Church, even in its pupilage under the law, 'Ye are My witnesses that I am God;' and then Jesus, in His parting address, as He was about to ascend, did lay it upon His Church in its mature age, 'Ye shall be witnesses unto Me, unto the uttermost part of the earth.' The Church, the witness to Jehovah, to Jesus, to the Truth, to Holy Writ, as containing the revelation of Him who is the Truth, and this both dogmatically by its teaching, and practically by its holy living.

From Genesis to the Revelation the book is one which no human intellect could have composed, no human wisdom have written. Its great, grand subject is the Incarnate God, from the first prophecy, even Adam in the image of God exercising God's delegated authority

over the works of His hand, τύπος τοῦ μελλοντος, 'the type of the coming One,' to the last uttered by His own lips, *Ναὶ, ἔρχομαι ταχύ*, 'I come quickly'—thus from the first chapter to the last bearing the impress of the one Mind, the one Author, revealing God's eternal purpose, 'the Will,' for whose full development He has taught us to pray, 'Thy will be done, as in heaven, so on the earth.'

In conclusion;—I have not exhausted this subject. I have not even attempted it. I have but skimmed its surface. It is the question of the day. It behoves us to have our minds fully made up upon it. Let me press upon my brethren, as I do upon myself, the very solemn office we are given to discharge, individually as well as collectively, in the words of the question, as 'witness and keeper of Holy Writ.' And if we would keep our minds unpolluted and unwarped by the many books we are tempted—nay, even required—to read at the present day, we must place the Bible at the head of every book, and let its pure light fall upon every page, and read it in that light; then shall we ourselves both be kept in the faith, and be strengthened to bear our faithful witness to those 'Holy Scriptures which are able to make wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus.'

THE ROCK.

'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.'—St. Matt. xvi. 18.

It is scarcely necessary for me to remark that round this saying of our Lord has raged for centuries one of the fiercest theological controversies that has ever disturbed the peace of the Church. The Church of Rome has made it the basis of her arrogant pretensions to supremacy, while all Protestant Churches have vigorously laboured to disprove the justness of her interpretation of the passage. It is much to be regretted that it has been thus made the subject of controversy, as thereby the deep and precious truth conveyed in it has been to a considerable extent kept out of view, and an interpretation favoured, at least of part of it, which appears to me to be altogether foreign to our Lord's intention, and to be at variance both with Scripture teaching and with observable fact.

Our Lord, with the purpose of presenting an important revelation of Himself to the disciples, proposed to them the question, 'Whom say ye that I (the Son of Man) am?' To which Peter replied: *Σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος*—'Thou art the Christ, the Son of God, the living God.' The emphatic words of the answer being the two last—*τοῦ ζῶντος*—the living One, *i.e.*, the living God.

We must take this declaration as the words, the

ipsissima verba, of God Himself. It must not be lowered down to a mere statement of the speaker's opinion, or that of his fellow Apostles, in opposition to the various opinions entertained of Him by others, that He was John, or Elias, or Jeremias, or one of the prophets. It is not—we say, or we think Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God—but, 'Thou art.' The utterance came forth in its perfection, as the assertion of a fact, unknown previously by Peter, untaught to him by any human being, not arrived at by any process of human thought, but being a special revelation by God Himself, made then and there, in order to perfect our Lord's design in proposing the question, and to present to the faith of the Church in all ages the great truth wrapped up in the words, and which He was about to complement by the further revelation from His own lips which followed.

It will, I think, be readily admitted that Peter did not comprehend the full import at least of the words he spoke, nor until 'the Spirit of Truth' had come to guide into the whole truth. This seems to me to be involved in the response of our Lord, 'Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but My Father which is in heaven.'

At a later period St. Paul claimed a special revelation to himself of that Gospel which he preached, untaught to him by any man, even as to the facts of our Lord's history, as appears from his Epistle to the Galatians, and in declaring which he assured the Corinthians that he spake them 'not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth' (1 Cor. ii. 12, 13). Similarly, I apprehend, did Peter utter the words now before us?

I have said that the emphatic words in the Apostle's declaration are 'τοῦ ζῶντος'—the living One. The life here contemplated demands a somewhat lengthened

consideration. Life has ordinarily two distinct applications, either as lifetime—the duration of existence; or as essential Being—the principle of living. We say, 'the life is in him,' or 'the life has left him.' We say of a stone, 'it has no life,' though the stone may have an eternal existence. In this latter sense it is used here, and as such is identical with mortality. Immortality is frequently, and most unphilosophically, confounded with endless duration, or existence, as if they were identical; whereas immortality is an innate and essential principle of the life of which I am speaking: a life which cannot cease to be, which cannot die, which cannot corrupt, which cannot be dissolved, which exists *ex necessitate naturæ*. Hence, writing to Timothy, St. Paul asserts of God, 'Who only hath immortality.' Justin Martyr, as quoted by Alford, says, 'He only who has immortality is called God, because He possesses life not from the will of another, even as all others who are immortal, but from His own being.' God has innate essential life, and He only hath this. Accordingly our Lord thus speaks: 'As the Father hath life in Himself, so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself' (John v. 26)—ζωὴν ἐν ἑαυτῷ. This ζωὴ ἐν ἑαυτῷ is innate essential life, *i.e.*, immortality. This gift of 'life in Himself' to the Son is, as all gifts to Him must be (for in His Deity He possesses all things without gift), as manifested in the flesh, the Son of Man, the Christ; and all gifts to Him as such are gifts for His Church, with which as His body, He, the Head, shares them; the life of the Head must be the life of the Body. Hence, subsequently, He reveals the channel through which this great gift of life, or immortality, is conferred on men. It is never conferred on angels. Though they, we believe, shall live, exist, endure—whatever word we use—for ever, yet will they not possess life in themselves; they will exist by the will of their Creator. 'God only hath immortality.'

In that wonderful discourse recorded by St. John in his Gospel, in which, more than in any other, our Lord treats of this life as conferred on men, He says, 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you'—ζωὴν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, life in yourselves—'whoso eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood hath eternal life.' He had previously expressed the same deep truth thus: 'I am the living bread which came down from heaven, if any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever.' Here, both negatively and affirmatively, He declares that the eating His flesh and drinking His blood is the way—the only way it must then be—whereby this gift of eternal life, life in one's self, is conferred on man; 'except ye eat . . . and drink ye have no life—He that eateth . . . and drinketh hath life.'

Let me digress for a moment. What is this way whereby, and whereby alone, eternal life is conferred on man? In other words, what is it to eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of Man? Of this I am confident, that one entirely ignorant of the controversial use that has been made of this passage, reading it for the first time, would naturally identify the eating and drinking with that faith of which our Lord speaks in the words, 'He that believeth on Me hath everlasting life' (verse 47), and which He Himself immediately after identifies with the eating of Him as the Bread of Life thus: 'I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever; and the bread that I will give is My flesh, which I will give for the life of the world' (verse 51) The whole teaching of our Lord may be thus expressed: '*Through faith in the Son of Man as the crucified one eternal life is bestowed on man.*' What bearing, then, has this declaration on the sacramental system? Is it not utterly to overthrow it? That system formulates itself thus: Baptism confers life, and the Eucharist sustains the life thus conferred. Has anyone ever ven-

tured to interpret the words 'eat My flesh and drink My blood' of baptism? Surely no one will make the venture, and yet this eating and this drinking is, as we have seen, the only means whereby life is conferred. Baptism, therefore, cannot be the mean. And since the Eucharist does not confer, but only sustains the life previously given, these words of our Lord can have no reference to that sacrament.

But to return to our subject. The special revelation to Peter supplies the answer to the question, Who is the Rock on which the Church is built? It is 'Christ, the Son of the living God,' and this, because He is the Son of *the living* God, of God the living One, possessing the life of God, essential life, 'life in Himself,' and through faith in Whom this same life is communicated to men. No doubt led by this, this Apostle wrote, 'To whom coming as unto a Living Stone, ye also as living stones are built up a spiritual house' (1 Epis. ii. 4, 5); the foundation on which the structure rests, and every stone thereof, instinct with life, which binds the whole as one—'that they all may be one; as Thou, Father, art in me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us' (John xvii. 21).

In the exposition of the text what appears to me to be a very serious error is constantly made, even that our Lord is speaking of the foundation of the Church. This may at first seem strange, but a little consideration will, I hope, establish my position. Two things totally distinct are in architecture called the foundation. One is the foundation of the building, the first layer of stones. This is the foundation of the building itself, a part of the structure. The other is the substratum on which the foundation is laid, the foundation under the foundation, and which constitutes no part of the building. Builders speak of having got a good foundation, be it solid clay or rock, on which to build, or of being unable to build in a certain place because they can obtain no solid foundation. It is but a

trite observation to say our Lord ever spake with the strictest accuracy. At the close of the Sermon on the Mount He marks this distinction. He compares the man who hears His sayings, and does them, to 'a wise man who built his house upon a rock, and . . . it fell not, because it was founded' (the foundation was laid) 'upon a rock' (Matt. vii. 24, 25). In St. Luke, of the unwise man He says, 'That without a foundation he built his house upon the earth' (Luke vi. 49). But whether laid on rock or sand, every house has a foundation of its own, apart from that under-foundation on which it is laid, and on whose character depends the stability of the house. And so the Church of Christ. It has a foundation of its own, 'the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets' (Ephes. ii. 20). And there is also an under-foundation, which supports the entire spiritual building, from the foundation to the top stone, the Rock of our text, Jesus Christ, the Son of the living God. The Church is thus '*fundata in fundamentum*.'

We must not pass over the words, 'Thou art Peter,' without remark. How frequently it is said, even by Protestants, that from these words it is evident that, in some sense, Peter must be the Rock. According to this assumption, the meaning assigned to πέτρος is 'a rock.' Whereas its true interpretation is 'a stone,' the detached portion of a rock, movable, unsteady, most unsuitable for a foundation. To say nothing of the Greek scholar, no mere English reader should ever have made this mistake, for we are expressly instructed by St. John (i. 43), that this name, given by our Lord to St. Peter meant a stone. The passage is, 'Thou shalt be called Cephas, which is by interpretation, a stone,' Cephas being the Aramaic form of the name. Here, as an instance of the confusion existing in the minds of some modern commentators, let me specify Alford, who translates 'stone' as the equivalent for Peter, while in his

remarks on our text he confounds 'rock' and 'stone,' asserting that πέτρος = κηφᾶς signifies 'a rock,' and further asserts, based on this mistranslation, for Peter a superiority as 'the first of those foundation-stones on which the living temple of God was built,' quoting Ephesians ii. 20. This passage certainly does not assign any superiority to one apostle, or prophet, over the others. Moreover, it is not of the foundation proper of the Church, as I have already shown, our Lord is speaking in the text, but of that under-foundation on which the foundation of the Church is laid.

Far, then, from this name 'denoting the personal position of this Apostle in the building of the Church of Christ,' it appears to me on the contrary as calculated, and so intended, to humble him. By the marked contrast which our Lord draws between πέτρος and πέτρα. He seems to me to indicate this as His design, under the special revelation that had been vouchsafed to Him. As He gave to St. Paul 'a thorn in the flesh, the messenger of Satan to buffet him, lest he should be exalted above measure through the abundance of the revelations;' so to Peter the Lord said, as it were, 'Thou art a stone, unsteady, movable, therefore on thee I could not build My Church, but on this rock, fixed, immovable, as revealed to thee, even Myself, the Christ, the Son of the living God, will I build My Church.' As St. Paul wrote to the Corinthians, 'other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ' (1 Cor. iii. 11).

We are now prepared to consider the promise, 'the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.' That a close connection exists between this promise and the previous statement must strike every attentive reader, 'Upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it,' that is, because built upon this rock. We have some misconceptions to clear away

before we proceed, misconceptions arising from the use of the word 'hell' in the Authorized Version, where it is employed to represent both Gehenna and Hades, the former the *place* of final punishment, 'the lake of fire and brimstone,' the 'everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels,' and of which the Lord spoke when He said, 'Fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.' The latter is the *state* of departed souls between death and the resurrection, as in the prophecy, 'Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell.' Under the misconception that the gates of hell 'mean the gates of Gehenna,' the promise before us is interpreted to be that the power of the devil shall not prevail to destroy the Church. Here is something very strange indeed. It presupposes that the devil is lord of Gehenna, the criminal lord of his prison-house!

Now, 'there is no power but of God,' and the prison-house of Gehenna can represent only the power of His 'justice' as the Law-giver. But the devil has a power, 'the power of death' (Heb. ii. 14), and this he exercises to the destruction of the Church from age to age, and it is given to him to prevail against the Church, 'to wear out the people of the saints of the Most High;' so that both Scripture and fact negative the view of the promise so generally entertained. But though cut off by death, is the Church therefore destroyed—gone for ever? Here in answer comes the promise of the text, 'The gates of Hades shall not prevail against it.' 'The gates of Hades' is the power of the unseen state of the soul after death. When severed from the body on death, the soul passes into the state of Hades, within its gates confined until the Resurrection, when, those gates opened by Him who is 'the Resurrection and the Life,' the soul shall return from its unseen and separated state, and reunited to the body restored from the state of death, shall come back through the opened gates, the resurrection thus

accomplished. The promise is, consequently, a promise of the Church's resurrection.

Thus St. Paul writes in 1 Corinthians xv., 'When this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, 'Death is swallowed up in victory: O death, where is thy sting? O Hades, where is thy victory?' The victory of Hades, obtained through death, shall then be at an end, the gates opened, 'the power thereof destroyed,' the souls of the redeemed bursting from Hades and the bodies from death, the whole Church rising into life, the song of victory shall peal through the echoing skies, 'Hades, where is thy victory?'

In connection with this subject two most important passages occur in the Book of the Revelation, where our Lord in vision presented Himself to the Apostle (chap. i.). He said, 'I am He that liveth and was dead, and behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen, and have the keys of Hades and of Death': the keys to open the gates and let the imprisoned free, and in fulfilment, too, of the promise of our text. In the twenty-first chapter we are told the winding up of the world's history in its present state, 'Death and Hades were cast into the lake of fire' (verse 14): death the state of the body, Hades the state of the soul during their separation; but at last both cast into Gehenna, the metaphor implying the utter destruction, and for ever, of the last enemy.

One more point remains to be briefly considered. The necessary connection between the promise and the foundation on which the Church rests. I have already plainly intimated that this connection exists in the immortal life of Him who is the foundation, which life is imparted to everyone who is a stone in the building. Our Lord declares Himself to be 'the resurrection and the life,' connecting these as one. The life that was His,

even while in mortal flesh, because conceived by the Holy Ghost, 'the Lord, and the giver of life,' energizing within that flesh as it lay in the tomb, raised Him up from death because 'it was not possible that He should be holden of it.' He rose in the power of that life, 'the first *born* from—the first *begotten* of—the dead' (Col. i. 18; Rev. i. 5). As it is also written in the second Psalm, 'Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee' (Acts xiii. 33). As this Risen One, the first immortal Man, is He the foundation, a living, not a dead foundation. It is His risen life that by the birth of the Spirit is communicated to the Church, 'according to the working of His mighty power which He wrought in Christ, when He raised Him from the dead' (Eph. i. 19, 20). It is this life of which St. Peter speaks, when he describes the members of the Church as 'being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible by the Word of God which liveth and abideth for ever' (1 Epistle i. 23). The soul thus instinct with life, this immortal life, incorruptible, indissoluble, this ζωὴ ἐν ἑαυτῷ, dies not on death, but imprisoned within the gates of Hades, waits until He who, as the Head, first burst from their portals, shall apply the key, unlock the gates, and set His members free; who then rising, 'the Church of the first-born,' the immortal Body of the immortal Head, the living stones of the spiritual building erected on Him, the living Rock, shall raise their shout of triumph over death and Hades, to which in fulfilment of the promise of the text, they shall then bid a long and lasting farewell.

THE COVENANT OBLIGATION OF THE LORD'S DAY.

'God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it; because that in it He had rested from all His work which God created and made.'—GENESIS ii. 3.

IN consequence of the more than ordinary interest at present existing on the subject of the Sabbath, and acceding to the request of some members of the congregation, I purpose this evening, through God's help, to lay before you the considerations which lead me to the belief of the covenant obligation of the fourth commandment. In doing so, I profess not to advance anything that has not been already said by others; yet for the sake of marking out a new path for myself, I design to reply to the latest effort, at least in this town, to disparage the observance of the Lord's day—a discourse, first preached in substance, and subsequently published, by an Arian minister. And if, brethren, I had had before the slightest doubt on my mind of the full sanctity of the day, that doubt would have been removed by the weakness and wickedness of the attempt. I do not remember having before read a discourse more characterized by omissions (which are positive arguments against the author's views), by assumptions, by illogical reasoning, which can scarcely impose on any thinking mind, and, I regret to be obliged to add, by immoral tendency. Throughout the discourse, the author appears to me to betray a consciousness of the

weakness of his cause, and to make desperate efforts to maintain what he felt was incapable of defence. Perhaps his difficulty arose from the position he chose—it is not easy to prove a negative; and he undertook to argue against, and to disprove the belief, that the observance of the Sabbath is of universal obligation, binding alike on Jew and Gentile.

Having taken this position, his chief course of procedure was boldly to grapple with the arguments by which the affirmative is maintained, and to expose, if he could, their weakness. But this he has not done: so far as his attack is concerned, these arguments were not even threatened; there is a total omission of all reference to them—an omission fatal to its object, and constituting a powerful argument against it. The controversy is too well known to allow anyone to plead ignorance of its details. Surely no one is justified in entering on a controversy with insufficient knowledge, especially when he takes the negative side; and it would be a libel on the acknowledged attainments of the author, even to insinuate the possibility of his unacquaintance with the case of his opponents. His omission, therefore, of all reference to their arguments, or, at least, the principal ones, is a tacit acknowledgment on his part that he felt them to be unanswerable; and they remain unassailed and unassailable by this very bitter and sarcastic foe of Sabbath observance.

Nor is this omission without its purpose; it was essential to an assumption at the very opening of the discourse, which is neither more nor less than a *petitio principii*—a begging of the entire question—and which underlies his every argument, and gives it its only strength. This will be apparent as we proceed.

The text of the discourse is Mark ii. 27, 28: 'The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath: therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath

day.' It opens with these words: 'The context shows that our Lord is here speaking of the *Jewish* Sabbath,' and 'during His lifetime no other Sabbath was known.' By 'Jewish' the author intends *what appertained exclusively to the Jews.* Here is the assumption which begs the entire question. If this be so, the controversy is at an end; of course, what was designed exclusively for Jews has no relation to Gentiles. The writer thus, at the outset, essays to preoccupy the mind of his readers (or hearers) with the opinion he advocates, as the basis of all or most of the arguments he afterwards advances. But I deny the statement altogether. Our Lord was not speaking of the Jewish Sabbath, and there was another Sabbath beside that of which He spake. You will bear in mind that everything that was among the Jews, or binding upon the Jews, was not therefore exclusively Jewish. The worship of the true God, the faith in the Messiah, the Saviour, though binding upon, and existing among the Jews, the very glory of that people, was not exclusively theirs. Thousands outside the pale of Israel, both before and since, enjoy these as their possession and glory. So, because the Sabbath day was binding in its observance on the Jews, it is not necessarily, exclusively Jewish, even if there were no other Sabbath known.

There was another Sabbath, a Sabbath exclusively Jewish, the Sabbath of the Ceremonial Law, the *seventh year:* every seventh year was as truly a Sabbath as every seventh day; but it appertained to the Jewish polity, and has passed away with it. The Sabbath day, however, though Jewish, as was the worship of the true God, yet was also human; it belonged to *man,* as man—not as a Jew—it was instituted for man, as man, the day after his creation; it was a primal and fundamental institution for the human race; a truth asserted by our Lord in the text of the discourse: 'The Sabbath was made for MAN'—a declaration that might have deterred the author from

hazarding the assertion that 'our Lord is here speaking of the *Jewish* Sabbath.' Were it so, He should have said, 'the Sabbath was made for the Jew, and not the Jew for the Sabbath, therefore the Son of David is Lord also of the Sabbath.' But passing by all national exclusivism, He goes back to the records of creation, and reiterates the truth that it was *for man* the Sabbath was instituted; therefore for the Jew as a man, binding on him as a son of Adam, not only as a son of Abraham. Every Jew is a man, but every man is not a Jew.

This is fatal to the assumption that the day was instituted for the Jew. Hence the omission in the discourse of any reference to the statement of our text, except in so far as the fourth commandment is quoted.

Perhaps I should also except a quotation from Exodus xxxi. 17, introduced for the purpose of proving that 'innocent recreations on the Sabbath day' are lawful, by the example of God Himself! The passage is, '*Now the Commandment given on Sinai says not one word against innocent recreations on the Sabbath day.*' (The italics are the author's.) In fact, the law of Moses distinctly sanctions recreation on the Sabbath. 'It is a sign between Me and the children of Israel for ever; for in six days Jehovah made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day He rested, and *was refreshed*.' (The italics here, too, are the author's.) Is it unlawful for man to do what the Almighty is represented as having done? The Sabbath was given as a refreshment to the sons of toil. Is it unlawful for man to do what the Creator is represented as having done? That is, enjoy 'innocent recreations on the Sabbath'—is it? Such as the author specifies in another part of the discourse—'music on Sundays by military bands.' Alas! what views of God can he entertain? or has he any at all?

Yes, God rested in His works and was refreshed. 'He saw everything that He had made, and behold it was

very good.' He made them to reflect His glory; to show forth His praise; to be a revelation of Himself, a theatre on which He would display His wisdom, power, mercy, love, goodness: He saw the end from the beginning, and He looked to all the purposes which they would fulfil, bringing 'glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will to men'—the future and destined inhabitants of earth. He saw all this—beheld His own glory manifested therein, and thereby and therefrom. He took pleasure in the works of His own hands, as they were, and will be for ever, and 'was refreshed.' And if we would follow the example—this example of our God—let us also look abroad upon His works, behold Him glorified therein, and raise the hymn of praise to Him who is thus so brightly and captivatingly revealed to our view; let us do this on the seventh day: then shall we also rest, as He did, and be refreshed. But to represent God as indulging in 'innocent recreations' on the Sabbath, is to depict Him as a Homer or a Horace did the pagan gods of old.

Recreations to be enjoyed on any day of the week should be innocent, but I deny that such as I have specified from the discourse are innocent on the Lord's day. This is again the begging of the question; if they be innocent on that day, let them by all means be pursued. They are not innocent, for they serve to wean the heart from God, to keep the mind from dwelling on His word, to make the world-tempted Christian weak against its assaults. They are not innocent, for they are forbidden. They were not innocent for Israel, as the discourse asserts, for God has given us a comment on the command, even for Israel; He has revealed His will on this very subject of seeking pleasure on the Sabbath. He says, giving Israel glorious promises if they observed this very command, 'If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath from doing THY PLEASURE on My holy day; and call the

Sabbath a Delight, the Holy of the Lord, Honourable; and shalt honour Him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding THINE OWN PLEASURE, nor speaking thine own words; then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord,' etc. (Isaiah lviii. 13, 14). '*Thy* pleasure—*thine own* pleasure.' Is this prohibited—was it—to the Jews? Does not God here 'prescribe an entire cessation even from those recreations that are lawful on other days?' Such a law is characterized in .the discourse as 'cruel—as a grinding bondage.' Yet here it is spoken of as 'a delight,' and the promise is annexed 'then shalt thou *delight thyself* in the Lord.'

Nor is there any reference to another fact, on which we rely, as proving the observance of the law in the early ages of the world—*that time was computed by weeks*. We have God Himself thus marking time, 'Yet *seven days* and I will cause it to rain upon the earth' (Gen. vii. 4); and Noah sent forth a dove, and 'stayed yet other *seven days*, and again sent forth the dove.' So likewise, once more 'he stayed yet other *seven days*, and sent forth the dove, which returned not again to him any more' (Gen. ix. 10, 12).

Time—days, months, years, are determined by the movements of the heavenly bodies—they are natural divisions: not so the week; it is a religious division—religious with reference to the Sabbath. Where, then, we meet with this division, 'seven days,' we have an undoubted proof of the observance of the Sabbath.

Yet again, there is a fatal omission, even of another fact which stares us in the face in all its deep significance. The Sabbath was observed by Israel before the law of the Ten Commandments was given on Sinai, and the record of this fact is in itself instructive. You will find it in Exodus xiv., in connection with the directions relating to the manna. Thus (verse 5), 'On the sixth day they shall prepare that which they bring in; and it shall be

twice as much as they gather daily.' Why this peculiarity? We are at no loss for an answer, supplied as it is by our text. God had sanctified the seventh day at early creation from all secular works, to be devoted to His own service. We are further informed (verse 22) 'that on the sixth day they gathered twice as much bread.' And on the matter being represented to Moses, he said, 'This is that which the Lord hath said, To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord.' Where had God said this? Even in our text, from the very beginning, when He *sanctified* the seventh day unto the Lord. And Moses said, eat that to-day, for to-day is a Sabbath unto the Lord, to-day ye shall not find it in the field. Six days ye shall gather it; but on the seventh day, which is the sabbath, in it there shall be none.'

From these three important facts—

1st. That the Sabbath was instituted at Creation 'for man.'

2nd. That time was computed by weeks, not by six, but *seven* days, which is a religious division, arising from the Sabbath.

3rd. That the Sabbath was observed by Israel before the promulgation of the Ten Commandments on Sinai—

we conclude that the Sabbath is not a Jewish ordinance, and was not instituted at the giving of the law to Moses. Facts, whose existence is ignored by the author of the discourse, and whose by no means innocent forgetfulness is essential to the course of argument he pursues, which is to start from the giving of the law to Moses, as if there we find the first mention of the Sabbath. He says, 'It will help to clear our view of this question if we begin with a glance at the Sabbath law, as it stood in the code of Moses.' He then strings together the fourth

commandment, as in the Decalogue, and all the injunctions in the ceremonial law bearing on its observance, and whereby that observance was enforced; 'and from all this,' he concludes, 'it is quite manifest that the fourth commandment, *as it stands in the law of Moses*, cannot bind us, because we are Gentiles. The precept was addressed to the Israelites exclusively. But we are not Israelites. The law, therefore, was not meant for us; and, of itself, it is not binding upon us.'

The ordinary reader would naturally conclude that the argument in this passage is simply this—the fourth commandment being addressed to Jews, since we are not Jews, is not binding on us; and if this were the argument, how withering the retort! The other nine precepts were also addressed to the Israelites, and since we are not Israelites they are not binding on us! therefore, we are not required to worship God alone—we may worship idols, we may dishonour our parents, steal, covet. No, the author perceived this, and in a footnote adds, 'that the whole Decalogue was addressed to the Israelites, and to them alone, the preamble itself shows.' He therefore guards himself from the attack to which otherwise he would be exposed, by inserting a few qualifying expressions, which will be passed over by the majority of his readers, but which deprive the argument altogether of its apparent strength. He says, 'the Commandment, *as it stands in the law of Moses— of itself* is not binding upon us.' These words, however, imply a suspicion, if not the actual conviction of the writer's own judgment, that the Command, under other conditions, may be binding on us. Else why these qualifying words? Do not we say the same? It is not our argument that the command *as it stands in the law of Moses* binds us. We assert that that precept is but the repetition of the earlier law imposed on man, as man; and we quote the opening word thereof—'Remember,' as expressing not the enactment for the

first time of a law, a new law before unknown, but as the re-enactment of one previously enjoined and obeyed.

Nor do we assert that, as given to Moses written on tables of stone, the terms of the Old Covenant, the ten commandments, have any binding power over us, for we are under the New Covenant; but in accordance with the terms of that New Covenant, 'I will put my laws in their minds and write them in their hearts;' that precept (as the others) is binding on the subjects of the New Covenant, 'in the fleshy tables of whose heart' it is written, and is obeyed—not as a servant, the command of his Lord, but as a child, the will of his loving Father. Hence, when these precepts are read in our public assemblies, as a condensed transcript of the Divine mind, we pray that God 'would write all these, His laws in our hearts.' This view of the Christian religion is the farthest from the author's mind, as his subsequent remarks evidence. He says, 'In fact this Christian Sabbath of the modern Sabbatarians is a thing shocking to the mind of every considerate man.' And further on, objecting to the teaching of the Shorter Catechism, that 'the whole day should be spent in the public and private exercises of God's worship, except so much as is to be taken up in the works of necessity and mercy,' he with indignation exclaims: 'Could any plan be devised more calculated to lead men to hate the Lord's day, and to hate God's worship, and to hate Christianity; yea, and to hate the great name of God himself, than to tell them that Christ, Christianity, and God require them to keep a Sabbath once a week, and to keep it in this horrible way? I use the word *horrible* with deliberation. The worship of God as Christ worshipped him, worship conducted in the cheerful spirit of Christ's religion, is a truly delightful exercise of the heart and soul. But the most delightful exercise (query, the worship of God?) becomes a grinding bondage, if the mind is to be kept to it without

change, cessation, or interruption, for such an interval of time. I know of no method more calculated to inspire a hatred of all that is good, than the attempt to enforce such a cruel law as this.'

It is difficult to read, much more to speak of, such a passage quietly. Emotions of pitying compassion for the awful state of the man who could pen it are almost overpowering. To spend an entire day with God—in His worship—is, in the writer's opinion, '*shocking, horrible.*' If to spend twelve or eighteen, or even twenty-four hours in uninterrupted communion with God be so horrible, so calculated to strike dread into the mind, what must it be to spend eternity with Him! Surely such a man could not enjoy His presence; to him heaven would be a very hell. I tell him that he knows nothing of Christianity, nothing of the Christian's heart when he so represents, or rather misrepresents, it. I tell him that the Christian's grief and burden is, not that he is to spend so much as one day in seven with Him, but that he is compelled to devote so much of other days to this present life; his joy is to be able to withdraw even from what is lawful on week-days, and to give up some portion of his business hours to communion with his God. He who spends his time with the view of laying up a store of merit with God, which will bring God in his debtor (but in which thing he will miserably fail), may well regard God's worship as a grievous burden, the which the less he bear the better; but the man—the sinner saved by Grace—whose transgressions are forgiven, who knows that his punishment was borne by the Saviour on the tree, who has received 'the gift of God, even eternal life in Jesus Christ, and in whom the spirit of adoption instinctively cries 'Abba Father;' and, as the law of its existence ever rises, like water to its level, in aspirations to its source above, that man will never feel, and does not feel, and cannot feel it a grinding bondage, a horrible thought, a shocking idea,

to spend the whole time of one day in the worship of God; it is the atmosphere in which alone he can breathe.

Throughout the discourse it is assumed that the Sabbath is part of Israel's ceremonial law. This is the point to be proved, but no proof is adduced, except it be what I have already alluded to, the connecting of certain precepts regarding the Sabbath with the fourth commandment. If this be intended as a proof, the argument is: Because we find in the ceremonial law certain enactments concerning the Sabbath, therefore the Sabbath is part of the ceremonial law. If this be not the argument, there is none whatever; if it be, how foolish, how illogical! Is the fourth the only command of the Decalogue in connection with which we find ceremonial injunctions? Might I not take the first, second, fifth, in fact, nearly all, and extracting from the ceremonial law all the injunctions and sanctions connected therewith, reason, as in the discourse, that therefore these commandments are ceremonial? If the argument be good for the fourth, it is equally good for the fifth. If the command to put the Sabbath transgressor to death argues the ceremonial character of the law, surely the command to put the dishonourer of his father or mother to death must prove similarly for the fifth.

In Matthew xv. our Lord connects a precept of the ceremonial law with the fifth commandment. He says, 'God commanded, saying, Honour thy father and mother; and he that curseth father or mother, let him die the death.' Did He thereby establish, or intend to establish, that the fifth commandment was only ceremonial, and is not therefore binding on us? Is this command moral? Has it reference to us? And, if so, why should not the fourth, notwithstanding the ceremonial precepts connected with it?*

* Every command of God, whatever its nature, imposes a moral obligation, even the obligation of its observance, on those to whom

Equally illogical are his other arguments. He says, and says truly, that our Lord 'repeatedly did things which were *regarded by the Jews* as violations of the Sabbath,' and he reasons that thus He 'avowedly violated the statute of the Sabbath.' Let me ask, Were the Jewish traditions the command of God? these He violated—'which were regarded by the Jews as violations,' and which led the Saviour to rebuke them as hypocrites—but no instance is specified of a violation of the fourth commandment, and I know not any. Even the Jews did not object to a walk through the fields. A Sabbath day's journey was lawful, and the Mount of Olives, Jesus' favourite retreat, was only a Sabbath day's journey from Jerusalem. He permitted His disciples to pluck and rub the ears of corn in their hands; this was opposed to a Jewish tradition, but not to the command. The bed which He commanded the healed man to carry was only a mat on which he lay and sat, and the covering, his outer garment. Jewish traditions were excessively burdensome on this point. Jesus did not once violate the statute of the Sabbath.

The next line of argument is that of *omissions*, a powerful one in its place, as I have already shown. Here the author ventures to specify three instances, in each of which there is, he says, no reference to the Sabbath. 'He, the Lord, omitted it in a very marked and significant manner, on occasions when, if binding *in perpetuum*, it would have been sure to be mentioned.'

First instance: 'When He was asked, Which is the first commandment of all? He answered, The first of all the commandments is, "Hear, O Israel: the Lord our

it is addressed. Hence the ceremonial law of Israel was of moral obligation to that people. If it be maintained that the Sabbath is only a ceremonial ordinance, be it so. Yet this does not destroy its moral obligation. Having been instituted for man, there is on man, all men, the moral obligation of its perpetual observance.

God is One Lord, and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength;" this is the first Commandment; and the second is like, namely this: "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." There is none other commandment greater than these.' Having quoted this passage at length, our Anti-Sabbatical preacher subjoins as his argument, 'No word of a Sabbath here.' Indeed! Indeed! No, nor, on the same principle, is there a word here of murder, or adultery, or stealing, or any other thing enjoined or prohibited by the Decalogue. I deny the statement. There is a word of the Sabbath, as much as of any other thing comprised in the Decalogue. The Lord's answer deals with the principle which keeps the law, even 'love, which is its fulfilling'; and in the love of God there is the observance of all in the law relating to God, and of these the Sabbath is one, and in the love of our neighbour there is the observance of all relating to him. 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God' is the essence of the first four commandments; 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour' is the essence of the last six. Had the quotation been taken from St. Matthew's Gospel (chap. xxii. 40), we should have had before us a direct contradiction of the author's argument. 'On these two Commandments hang ALL the law and the prophets.' 'No,' says he; 'there is a mistake here. Not all: not the fourth command; there is no word of a Sabbath here.'

Second instance: 'When he was asked, "What good thing a man should do that he might inherit eternal life," he briefly enumerated the *moral* commandments of the Decalogue, but made no reference to the ceremonial precept, that of the Sabbath.' You see here the assumption that the Sabbath is a ceremonial precept—the very point in debate—but I pass this; and I ask, Why was not our Lord's reply given in His own words? Because if it were, even this man would not, and could not, have

adventured the assertion that he enumerated the *moral* precepts of the law. Neither is the extract given, nor the passage specified, as in the other two cases. The statement is incorrect. The Lord does not enumerate the moral precepts of the law; He specifies only those which refer to our neighbour. Now, the argument from the omission of the fourth commandment is, that therefore its observance was not necessary in order to attain eternal life. Is it sound? Then neither is the observance of the first, nor the second, nor the third; for these—all moral commandments, pointing out the way in which we are to manifest the love of God—are omitted, too; and, by the preacher, the very bold and startling assertion—thoroughly infidel—is, in effect, made, that the Saviour taught that the love of God is unnecessary for eternal life; only the love of our neighbour (Matt. xix. 16-19). To what fearful lengths will not men go in their opposition to the Word of God!

Third instance: 'When the Apostles and Elders, and the whole Church of Jerusalem, took into consideration what portions of the ceremonial law it might be expedient, for peace' sake, to require the Gentile believers to observe, they named only four, viz., that they should abstain "from meat offered to idols, and from things strangled, and from fornication, and from blood" (Acts xv. 5-29). They never enjoined upon them, as a religious duty, to keep Sabbath either on the first day of the week, or the seventh.' I scarcely know how to deal with this passage, there is so much in it that is truly demoralizing, as well as being in every respect incorrect. It also assumes that the Sabbath is part of the ceremonial law, and simply argues that, because it was omitted from the decree, which it is asserted contained those portions of the ceremonial law that it was expedient to enforce, therefore it is not binding on Christians. Passing by other matters, are we gravely told that the law against

fornication—the seventh commandment of the Decalogue—is part of the ceremonial law? and that the prohibition of it was enjoined as a matter of expediency, for peace' sake? Is it possible? Yes; here it is—no hastily-uttered expression, but one fully understood, thoroughly considered, written, printed, weighed. He enumerates the points of the decree, 'only four'; he specifies them; there is no mistake, no misunderstanding. He knew what was in the passage, and yet hesitates not to assert that the decree was concerned solely about ceremonial matters, and therefore that omissions are proof that the things omitted are not now in force. No; not ceremonial matters alone, but moral also, are comprised in it; and if there be any soundness in the reasoning, then every moral law omitted has also ceased to be binding on us. Nay, more than this, if the prohibition of the fearful sin of fornication was imposed as a matter of expediency, and for peace' sake, then, as soon as the expediency passed away, and the cause of enmity was removed, so also was the prohibition. And it is maintained by most persons (the universal eating of blood attests it) that that expediency has long since ceased, and the decree become obsolete. This is socialism with a vengeance. But nothing is too bad to be advanced, provided only some shadow of argument can be invented against one entire day's communion with God. Such an immoral statement is worthy of the man who could write, 'It would be a day of gloom and sadness, if we were required to devote every moment and every thought to the public and private exercises of God's worship. These exercises can, in my opinion, be very acceptably and edifyingly performed in a comparatively short period of time—indeed, far more usefully and improvingly than if they are made to occupy a long one'; and who can designate these exercises, when continued, as 'bitter penance and mortification'?

The only direct argument advanced against the ob-

servance of the Lord's day is based on those passages in which the observance of holy days is either referred to, or altogether condemned; the principal one of which is, Col. ii. 16, 17: 'Let no man judge you in respect of . . . the Sabbath days' or Sabbaths; therefore is the argument, the Sabbath is not a law for us. It seems to be overlooked, that a practice prevailed in many places to observe both the seventh day—the Sabbath, and the first day of the week—the Lord's day, under the impression of the moral obligation of both. To this practice the Apostle refers, and says, as it were, if in the weakness of your faith you observe the Sabbath day—the seventh, let no man judge you—to the Lord you observe it. But to advance this passage to neutralize the force of a primal law of the world's condition; to profane a day from the first sanctified by God, reserved for Himself, from man's own works, words, thoughts, pleasures—a law re-enacted among His moral commands—is certainly among the most childish efforts of reasoning the world ever witnessed.

I have already remarked that most of the precepts of the Decalogue had ceremonial ordinances connected with them respectively, in order to instruct Israel in the details whereby they should be carried into execution. Thus, the Decalogue had, so to speak, a ceremonial, as well as a moral side, connected, yet distinct; the former was exclusively for Israel, and has passed away with the Jewish polity—the latter remains. To introduce into the commandments the ceremonial ordinances, as essentially part thereof, is to throw confusion into the work of God. Yet this has been done with one commandment—the fourth. The ceremonial command, not to light a fire on the Sabbath day, and similar ones have been thus attached to it; and we have been taunted with disobedience to the fourth commandment, because we regard not these precepts. We disobey them because they form no part

at all of the commandment. As well might we be taunted with disobedience to the other commandments, because we do not obey all that is written connected with them in the Levitical Code. 'The law, not in the letter, but in the spirit,' is the law of the New Covenant, and we are bound to obey the fourth commandment in the spirit thereof, and for this it matters not what day we keep, provided only we keep a day. And when we establish the fact of the Apostles and early Christians assembling on the first day of the week for worship, and that the Holy Spirit has given to that day a peculiar designation, 'the Lord's day,' we then apply to it, and are not only justified, but bound to apply to it the spirit of the fourth commandment, whose observance is established as binding on man, for whom it was made, and in that spirit devote the day unreservedly to Him ; and we do it with joy, 'as a pleasure, a delight ;' and whatever can be done in His service, and in whatever way it may be necessary to employ our servants or our cattle in His service, is within the spirit of the day's observance. The day is the Lord's—the entire day—all its hours, and all earth's goods and inhabitants, men and cattle alike, are His peculiarly on that day.

To use ourselves, or our cattle, for our own worldly ends or pleasures; or to take His hours and occupy them with our own thoughts and words, and works, is to rob the Lord of that day which is His, and which He has graciously sanctified also for our spiritual good. To take a walk in the fields is not, and never was, a breach of the Sabbath law, provided only that we take Christ with us, and walk with Him, as did the two disciples that walked to Emmaus. As they spoke of Him, He drew near, and 'expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself.' So, if we make the fields the place of our meditation of Him on the Lord's day, the world shut out—'our closet, the door shut'—in spirit He will

draw near to us and reveal to our souls more and more of Himself, whom our souls desire to know. But all this is a foreign language to him who regards one day spent in communion with Him a shocking thing, a horrible thought.

In all the writings of anti-Sabbatarians there is a strange confusion between the Covenant and the ceremonial laws. The former, from its very nature, is of universal obligation; the latter binds only Israel, while the Israelitish polity exists. In the Scriptures there is no such confusion. They are strongly marked in their respective peculiarities, and were delivered to Israel each in a different manner. The Covenant Law, comprised in the ten commandments, was spoken so by God, that 'Israel heard the voice of God speaking these commands out of the midst of the fire.' And while he spake them thus in audible voice, surrounded with all the terrible glory that accompanied Him, so dreadful, 'that even Moses said, I exceedingly fear and quake,' He had them written with His own finger on two tables of stone. He called Moses up to the Mount and gave him these tables, containing this law, God's Covenant with Israel, 'even ten commandments' (Deut. iv. 12, 13), the commands of which, when in after-ages 'manifest in the flesh,' He said, 'If thou will enter into life keep the commandments.' These first tables were broken, and Moses was directed to hew Him out two other like unto them, and bring them up to the Mount, and on these God wrote this law, these identical ten commands. 'These words,' said Moses, 'The Lord spake unto all your assembly in the Mount, out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, and of the thick darkness, with a great voice, and He added no more; and He wrote them in two tables of stone, and delivered them unto me' (Deut. v. 22). This law is well defined; repeatedly it is said to be 'ten commandments'; and here we read, 'He added no more.' More

He spake unto Moses; numerous commands, injunctions, directions, ordinances He spake and established; but to that law which Israel had heard and received on the tables of stone, He added not one command more. All else He spake was of a different character; not of the essence of the Covenant; no part of the Covenant, nor spoken as an addition thereto, such addition being repudiated and condemned by 'He added no more.' What God has not done, the author of the discourse has; he has added to the law some portions of the other, the ceremonial, and from this forbidden addition he has concluded that the fourth commandment belongs not to the law with which God has connected it, and has dared to tear it from that law and add it to that other law, which was only temporary in its duration.

And marking still more distinctly, the peculiar nature of the ten commandments, is the place where God ordered the tables to be kept—'He wrote on the tables, according to the first writing, the ten commandments, which the Lord spake unto you in the Mount, out of the midst of the fire, in the day of the assembly, and the Lord gave them unto me. And I turned myself and came down from the Mount, and put the tables in the ark which I had made; and there they be, as the Lord commanded me' (Deut. x. 1-5)—and 'there was nothing in the ark save the two tables of stone, which Moses put there at Horeb, when the Lord made a covenant with the children of Israel, when they came out of the land of Egypt' (1 Kings viii. 9). And this ark, containing the testimony, and nothing else, was deposited in the most holy place, the type of heaven itself; above, upon the ark, was the mercy-seat, where God spake unto Israel (Exod. xxv. 21, 22)—and on that mercy-seat was to be offered the blood of atonement for sin, on that great day of atonement, when the high priest was to pass with blood within the vail, and 'sprinkle it on the mercy-seat,'

and then coming forth, having made the atonement, to put his hands on the head of the scapegoat, and confess over him all the sins of the people; and then to send this goat, to whom the iniquity had been thus typically transferred, by a trusty messenger, into the wilderness, there to bear away that iniquity, to be remembered no more for ever (Lev. xvi.).

Was there nothing in this union? The ten commandments, the mercy-seat, the atoning blood, the Holy of holies, the imputed sin, the forgiven and forgotten iniquity—'Sin is the transgression of the law'—the law placed within the ark; and that is the type of heaven: to teach, that the violation of that law is sin against the God of heaven, which will exclude from His presence for ever—to teach, that atoning blood is necessary to blot out that sin, and free the transgressor from its consequence—to teach, that the sin is imputed to another, even to Him whom the scapegoat typified, and that He 'bare that sin in His own body on the tree;' pouring out His life's blood to atone therefor—to teach, that sin thus blotted out is remembered no more, and the transgressor is reconciled to his God for ever.

No ceremonial precept was in that ark; for the breach of such entailed not eternal, only in some cases, temporal death; while the breach of the moral law ensures the second death, which is the lake of fire. The breach of the *ten* commandments—of the fourth as of the rest—is thus pronounced to be of fearful magnitude, to require a mercy-seat, an atoning blood, a scapegoat, even the atonement that is in the blood of Jesus, 'God manifest in the flesh.'

What, virtually, is the conduct of the man who pronounces the fourth commandment part of the ceremonial law? Even to approach the ark, and with daring hand erase that commandment from the Covenant, and proclaim it a mistake that inserted it therein. It is

there; in the terms of the New Covenant it is written in our hearts—'We delight in the law of God after the inward man'—and enjoying these periodical glimpses, so graciously given, of that better rest which God has in store for us, who 'are washed from our sins in His own blood,' we hail with joy the weekly advent of the Lord's Day; the foretaste of that eternal day of the Lord, which He will usher in, when, no more the 'man of sorrows and acquainted with grief,' but as 'the Lord my God He shall come and all the saints with Him' (Zech. xiv. 5). Then shall those who mourned over the impediments to uninterrupted communion with Him now enjoy that communion in all the fulness of its satisfying pleasures with Him 'in whose presence is the fulness of joy, and at whose right hand there are pleasures for evermore.'

THE TRANSFIGURATION.

It might be considered superfluous at this age of the Church to try to impress upon its members the importance, the duty, and the necessity of studying the predictive portions of the Scriptures—those which direct our faith onwards to the great winding up of the world's mysterious history at the appearing of the Son of man, the subject having been presented now so many years to the attention of men, both in the press and in the pulpit. But the tone of recent commentaries and expositions shows incontestably that there still exists an imperative necessity to urge Christian men 'to take heed unto the sure word of prophecy.'* Our Lord's warning exhortation ought surely to be sufficient, 'Behold I have told you before. What I say unto you I say unto all, Watch;' the certainty of the event and the uncertainty of the time adding emphasis to His teaching—in fact, giving it all its peculiar force.

In accordance with this is all the teaching of the Apostles in their respective writings. Believers in the Christ are described as those who wait for, look for, love His appearing. St. Paul expresses his own individual expectation: 'Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown

* 2 Peter i. 19. This passage should be read thus: 'We have the word of prophecy *made* more sure (*i.e.*, confirmed). Whereunto ye do well that ye take heed (as unto a lamp shining in a dark place, until the day dawn and the day star arise) in your hearts.'

of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, will give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love His appearing.' To Titus he writes that the grace of God brings salvation, teaching us to live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world; and as regards the future, teaching us to look for that blessed hope, even the appearing of the glory of the great God and our Saviour, Jesus Christ. Men have substituted for this an entirely different hope, even on death to go up to heaven, there to dwell for ever with the Saviour, regardless of the resurrection at His coming. In direct contrariety to this, St. Paul instructs the Corinthians (2 Epistle v. 1-4), 'earnestly desiring—ἐπιποθοῦντες' (longing, R.V.)—'to be clothed upon . . . not for that we would be unclothed, but that we would be clothed upon, that what is mortal—τὸ θνητὸν—may be swallowed up of life—οὐ θέλομεν ἐκδύσασθαι—we do not desire to be unclothed.' The coming of our Lord Jesus Christ and the gathering together unto Him is, then, our desire, our hope, according to the Scriptures, and at His coming the establishment of the kingdom of God.

The coming of the Lord and the kingdom are so intimately connected that they cannot be conceived as ever separated; hence the expression, 'coming in His kingdom,' and the penitent robber's petition, 'Lord, remember me when Thou comest in Thy kingdom,' a petition in accordance with Daniel's account of his vision, in chapter vii., verses 13, 14. This vision is the source of all those passages in the New Testament which speak of our Lord coming in, or with, the clouds of heaven.

Now, though the life of our Lord was one of the deepest humiliation and suffering, yet on certain occasions He thought fit to assert His true dignity, and to exhibit His real glory, as the result of His sufferings, as 'the joy that was set before Him, for which He endured

the cross, despising the shame.' Such an occasion was His manifestation to the Gentiles, when the gifts and homage of the eastern sages were an earnest of the homage of the whole earth (Ps. lxxii. 8-15; Isa. lx. 6-10). Another similar occasion was His riding into Jerusalem a few days only before His death, when He openly avowed Himself the Messiah King. But especially on the Mount of the Transfiguration did He exhibit the glory in which He will appear when He shall 'take unto Him His great power and reign; when the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdom of the Lord and of His Christ.' The reference of this scene to His coming and kingdom must at the outset be established. The account of the Transfiguration occurs in the first three Gospels, and in each is immediately preceded by a declaration by the Lord, that the Son of man shall come in the glory of His Father with the holy angels. This is followed by the promise, in evident connection with the statement—might we say *suggested* by it?—'There be some of them that stand here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in His kingdom' (Matt. xvi. 28); 'till they see the kingdom of God come with power' (Mark ix. 1); 'till they see the kingdom of God' (Luke ix. 27). 'The Son of man coming in His kingdom' and 'the coming of the kingdom of God with power' are only two different forms of expression conveying the same truth—'the Son of man shall come in the power of His kingdom and set up the kingdom of God on earth.'

In fulfilment of this promise was the scene on the Mount, when, a few days after—'six days,' 'about eight days'—Jesus brought Peter, James, and John up into an exceeding high mountain, and exhibited to them His glory—'His own glory' in which He will appear when He 'cometh in His kingdom.' St. John's reference to this scene is short but pregnant: 'The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us (and we beheld His glory—

glory as of the only begotten from the Father)'—the glory of the incarnate Word, the glory of the Son of man, when He shall appear in the power of the kingdom of God.

St. Peter's appeal to what he and his companions witnessed on the Mount is decisive as to the character and design of the revelation. The great subject of his teaching, as of that of all the Apostles, was the coming of the Christ and the 'salvation ready to be revealed in the last time.' He desired, even gave diligence, that the Christians for whom he wrote his Epistles might after his departure (ἔξοδον) be able to call these things to their remembrance at all times. On his own mind the reality of the coming and kingdom was deeply impressed. He had all the evidence that could possibly reach his understanding. The sure word of prophecy had revealed all to him; and he had that word confirmed to him by the evidence of his own eyesight, than which nothing could be more convincing. With confidence, therefore, he asserts, 'We have not followed cunningly-devised fables, when we made known to you the power and coming (or presence) of our Lord Jesus Christ, but we were eye-witnesses of His majesty.' This majesty was therefore 'the power and coming' of the Christ, 'the coming of the Son of man in His kingdom,' 'the coming of the kingdom of God with power.' Nor does he leave us in any doubt as to the time and place, when and where, he saw this coming and kingdom. He adds: 'He received from God the Father honour and glory, when there came such a voice to Him from the excellent glory, This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; and this voice we heard when we were with Him in the holy mount.' From all these references no room is left for doubt that the Transfiguration was 'the coming of the Son of man in His kingdom, the kingdom of God come with power, the coming and power of our Lord Jesus Christ.'

We have now to consider the scene itself in its details. We have of these: 1. Our Lord Himself in glory. 2. His two glorified companions. 3. The unglorified disciples. 4. The cloud. These are the principal incidents.

1. The scene was designed to manifest the glory of the Christ especially, not His Divine glory as abstract Deity, but His glory as the Word become flesh; the glory of the Man Christ Jesus. The language in which the change in His appearance is described is a strong proof of this: 'He was transfigured;' the word imparts a change of form, that is, His humble human form, in which His Deity tabernacled was transfigured for one of glory. In St. Luke ix. 19 it is said, 'the fashion of His countenance was altered'; and St. Matthew and St. Mark say, 'His face did shine as the sun; and His raiment became white as snow' (compare Rev. i. 13-15; Ezek. i. 26; Dan. vii. 9). He did not lay aside His human body, but was glorified in it. The utmost importance attaches to this, because of our interest in it; for in His glory we see that to which He designs to conform us in the day when, rising from the dead, we shall see Him as He is, and be like Him (see 1 John iii. 2; Col. iii. 4; Phil. iii. 20, 21). In the glory of Christ as God the redeemed can have no share; they cannot be manifested in it, nor personally be interested therein; they can be interested only in that glory which Jesus has earned for Himself as their Redeemer. As surely as Christ suffered for them, so surely was He glorified for them. By suffering in human nature He has procured for it glory, which He claims as the reward of His righteousness and obedience unto death; a glory for that nature which He has thus raised in His own person. To Him in His pre-existent state it was unnecessary, possessed as He was of all the glory of eternity. The voice from 'the excellent glory' confirms this, that it was the reward of His obedience unto death, as it is written, 'Being found in fashion as a man, He

humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross. Wherefore' (because of this humiliation and death) 'God hath also highly exalted Him,' etc. (Phil. ii. 8, 9). As at His baptism the words, 'This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased,' conveyed the Divine sanction for the work He was about to undertake, and His perfect qualification, when the Spirit descended on Him from on high and abode with Him, so here they convey to men for their comfort and peace, in anticipation, the Father's approval of His work as perfected, and His acceptance of human nature, not before, since Adam's fall, acceptable in His sight.

2. The two saints who appeared in glory with Christ. I conceive that this adds to the evidence already adduced, that the glory was not the Divine glory, but that which the Saviour vouchsafed to obtain for man. By introducing into the scene two of His redeemed invested with like glory, He gave a strong confirmation that the glory was an earnest of that which is to come; and by seeing two of its members so invested, the Church had an indisputable assurance that the glory is its own.

But why were Moses and Elias specially selected for the occasion? Can we hesitate to answer, because in their respective persons they represented the two classes of the saints who shall pass into glory from this mortal state?—the first, by death, followed by resurrection in immortality and incorruption at the coming of the Lord; the second, by translation, without dying, caught up to meet Him as He descends. Thus we read, 'We shall not *all* sleep, but we shall *all* be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed' (1 Cor. xv. 51, 52). Somewhat more fully: 'Them which sleep in Jesus will God bring with Him. For this we say unto you, by the Word of the Lord, that we which are alive, and remain unto the

coming of the Lord, shall not prevent' (precede, R.V.) 'them that are asleep. For the Lord Himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first, then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we be ever with the Lord' (1 Thess. iv. 14-17). Though in a moment all shall take place, yet there will be order. The voice of the archangel shall waken the saints sleeping in their graves, who, rising in life immortal and incorruptible, shall mingle with the living saints on earth, their mortal bodies also changed into immortal and incorruptible, bodies; and then both, one glorious multitude, shall be caught up to meet the descending Lord, and 'the Lord my God shall come and all the saints with thee' (Zech. xiv. 5). Of these two ways in which believers pass into glory Moses and Elias were examples, or types: Moses slept—he died; Elias died not—he was translated, caught up into heaven. Thus was the whole Church represented in this scene of the coming glory and kingdom of the Redeemer, sharing the glory and consequently reigning with Him.*

* 'They spake of his decease—ἔξοδον, departure—which he was about to accomplish at Jerusalem.' This word ἔξοδος is remarkable, 'because in its wider range of meaning it covered all the special phenomena connected with the close of the ministry of the lawgiver and the Tishbite (comp. Deut. xxxiv. 5, 6; 2 Kings ii. 12), and not less so the resurrection and ascension of our Lord, as well as the crucifixion' (Bishop Ellicott's 'Commentary.') 'The word, as Godet shows, is especially chosen to include the death and ascension of Christ' (The 'Speaker's Commentary'). 'Vocabulum valde grave, quo continetur passio, crux, mors, resurrectio, ascensio.' (Bengel). May we not conclude from this that the scene was designed for the Lord Himself, to strengthen Him to pass through the fearful ordeal that was before Him, but which should eventuate in the glory of His kingdom? 'For the joy that was set before Him He endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God.'

3. The persons who were privileged to witness the glorious scene, and who also fulfilled a representative character in it. 'He took with Him Peter, James, and John, and was transfigured before them'—three unglorified believers. As one reason why they were present, we can quote Peter's own words, when vindicating the Church's hope as not following 'cunningly-devised fables' when looking for 'the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.' He says: 'We were eye-witnesses of His majesty.' No description or historical record could bring such convincing proof to the minds of believers as the testimony of three eye-witnesses who could say they had beheld His majesty and glory.

But, similarly as Moses and Elias, they occupied a representative position, even of the nations of the earth, converted to Christ when He comes, but not glorified. Thus when we look to the Mount of the Transfiguration we behold Christ's future kingdom, so to speak, *in miniature*. It is on earth; our Lord is there in His glorified humanity; His saints are with Him sharing His glory—His saints both risen and translated—risen as Moses, translated as Elias; the converted nations of the earth, as represented by Peter, James, and John, in ordinary, not glorified, humanity. Such will be the kingdom of the Christ at His appearing.

4. Another accompaniment of the vision, which is of the utmost moment in deciding its character and reference, must be specially noted, the 'bright cloud which overshadowed them.' It overshadowed Jesus, Moses, and Elias, and 'they' (the Apostles) 'feared when they' (the glorified ones) 'entered into it.' It was a cloud of heaven's own glory. In the prophecies this specially marks 'the coming of the Son of man in His kingdom.' In the vision of Daniel (chap. vii.) we read 'I saw in the night visions, and behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of

Days, and they brought Him near before Him. And then was given Him dominion and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations and languages should serve Him: His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and His kingdom that which shall not be destroyed' (verses 13, 14). His kingdom to be shared with the saints—'And the kingdom, and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom *under the whole heaven* shall be given to the people of the saints of the most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey Him' (verse 27). In these two quotations from Daniel we have an exposition of the scene on the Mount of the Transfiguration.

Our Lord appropriates this prophecy to Himself. 'Then shall appear* the sign of the Son of man in heaven; and then shall all the tribes of the earth' (land) 'mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory' (Matt. xxiv. 30). Again, in answer to the adjuration of the High Priest, 'Tell us whether Thou be the Christ, the Son of God' (xxvi. 63, 64), He answered: 'Thou hast said; nevertheless, I say unto you, hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.' It was surrounded with the bright cloud of heaven's glory that He ascended into heaven; and the promise given to console the disciples on their Master's departure was that He 'shall so come in like manner—that is, in the clouds—as they saw Him go into heaven' (Acts i. 11).

Once more, the subject of the book which specially is 'the revelation of Jesus Christ' is, 'Behold He cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see Him,' etc. (Rev. i. 7).

Thus have we given to us a defined view of our future state. The Church in these latter times has a most un-

* 'The sign of the Son of man' is the Son of man Himself, just as 'the sign of the prophet Jonas' was Jonas himself.

defined view of that future. The hope of the resurrection from the dead, that most blessed hope, which speaks to man's nature, and to his sympathies, is exchanged for the being unclothed, disembodied; the pagan view of the future in ignorance of the Divine revelation of the resurrection being adopted by the Church. Alas! *immaterialized being*, which is most undesirable, substituted for the substantial reality of the resurrection unto life.* 'Not that we would be—οὐ θέλομεν—unclothed, but clothed upon that mortality might be swallowed up of life' (2 Cor. v. 1-5), the almost identical words the Apostle uses in 1 Corinthians xv., where he treats so fully of the

* Perhaps a mistaken view of the words 'spiritual body' has mainly contributed to this. St. Paul distinguishes between the σῶμα ψυχικὸν and the σῶμα πνευματικόν: the former the body of the present life, the mortal body; the latter the body of the resurrection, the immortal body. The former derived from the first Adam, who became ψυχὴν ζῶσαν; the latter from the second Adam, who became πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν. The life gives to the body its characteristic. The ψυχὴ life actuates the present body; the πνεῦμα life quickens the future, the resurrection body. The body is in each case the same; the life is different. The body in each case is 'flesh and bones,' not 'flesh and blood.' Our Lord's own statement is peculiarly full: 'See My hands and My feet, that it is I Myself; handle Me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye behold Me having' (Luke xxiv. 39). The same flesh and bones as before His death, but the life, the actuating force, totally different. Our Lord's resurrection was altogether distinct from the resurrection of Lazarus and others, who were recalled to ψυχὴ life by a fiat of power, but to die again. His resurrection was a birth into an altogether new life. The spirit of life. God, the Holy Spirit, begat in His dead body, as it lay in the tomb, spiritual life. He was thus 'born, begotten from the dead' (Ps. ii. 7, Col. i. 18, Rev. i. 5). And because the Church shall also be thus born from the dead, He is designated 'the first-born—the first begotten of, or from, the dead.' Hence His body was spiritual—*i.e.*, having spiritual life: not immaterial, but as material as when He was born of the Virgin. 'See,' He says, 'it is I Myself; handle Me; feel My material hands and feet; and be assured I am the very Jesus you associated with before I died.' The bearing of this on various matters of controversy will at once be recognised.

resurrection. Until the resurrection mortality triumphs. It is then that this mortal shall put on immortality, and this corruptible shall put on incorruption. In the body, while it is unregenerate, we groan, being burdened because of sin; but can we not look to the time when it shall be builded up anew in holiness? Can we not look upwards to Christ, who, in holy, risen, and glorified flesh, is now seated on the Father's throne, and in the sure and certain hope of being like Him, await the resurrection? Until then we cannot be like Him in glory. Until then this body of our humiliation shall not be fashioned like unto the body of His glory. He Himself, in prophecy, looked forward to His resurrection: 'My flesh shall rest in hope, for Thou wilt not leave My soul in hades, neither wilt Thou suffer Thine Holy One to see corruption.' And though, unlike Him, we shall see corruption, unless we shall be alive and remain unto His coming, yet shall we be like Him when we shall awake from the sleep of death to die no more. 'I shall be satisfied when I awake with Thy likeness.'

The scene on the Mount substantiates to us our hope, and the vision may be translated into the words of St. Paul: 'Behold I show you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible; and we shall be changed.'

Further still, the Transfiguration reveals perfected humanity—humanity as in the eternal purpose of God. At its creation human nature was imperfect, surrounded with infirmities, weak and mortal. 'The Word became flesh,' as thus weak and mortal; He hungered, thirsted, was weary, felt sorrow deeply and keenly, and died. He rose, leaving for ever all these infirmities and mortalities; He rose to die no more; He rose the perfected man. The Resurrection was the completement of the Incarna-

tion. At the Transfiguration He appeared, in anticipation, the perfected man, the fulfilment of the purpose of God, as He now is and will be for ever, 'the image of the invisible God.'

But He was not alone, the individual Christ, for 'Moses and Elias appeared in glory,' one with Him in His glory, therefore one with Him in His risen life, exhibiting there the full union for which He prayed (John xvii.) between Him and His people. For the life of the head is the life of the body, and the glory of the head is the glory of the body. The type of the marriage of the first Adam and the first Eve, 'signifying unto us the mystical union that is betwixt Christ and His Church,' was thus fulfilled in the perfected humanity of both the risen Christ and the risen Church, one for ever.

Who can tell the far-reaching issues of the scene on the Mount of the Transfiguration?

'BY THE HAND OF A MEDIATOR.'

We are informed by various writers that there are more than four hundred interpretations of this passsage—Galatians iii. 19, 20—whose difficulty is considered to arise from its brevity. It would be very presumptuous in me to suppose that the view I am about to present may not be found among so many: that, in fact, it is altogether new. Such can scarcely be said to be the case. In the differences of opinion that exist among expositors, and the reasons they assign for their differences, so far as they have come under my observation, I have detected what appears to me to be the key of the interpretation; and from their ways of dealing with it, I have been led to an exposition altogether different from what any, at least, of our modern exegetes maintain. So diverse are the views of these magnates of exposition that, if we lesser folk hold any opinion at all, we are compelled to reject what some of them propound. And if, finding it impossible to accept all interpretations, we alike reject all, we cannot be charged with daring presumption, for we are only so far following the examples of those who deal similarly with others, fully their equals in learning and judgment.

The passage for consideration is, 'It (the Law) was ordained (or administered) by (or through) angels ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου. Ὁ δὲ μεσίτης ἑνὸς οὐκ ἔστιν, ὁ δὲ Θεὸς εἷς ἐστίν. The translation of which is, A.V. and R.V., 'in (R.V. by) 'the hand of a mediator. Now, a mediator is not *a*

mediator of one; but God is one.' Now, it may be considered very daring in me to assert that the difficulty with merely English readers arises from the mistranslation of ὁ μεσίτης; the article being almost, if not altogether, ignored; and, consequently, what is very definite is treated as being very indefinite, *a* mediator, *any* mediator. The Apostle is thus represented as making a statement about mediators in general, whose office is to go between antagonistic parties, and to reconcile them. Applying this to St. Paul's argument, the two parties between whom the mediator intervenes are God on the one hand, and Israel on the other, as considered by some to be implied in the words, 'God is one,' viz., one of the parties between whom the mediator goes. I know that this application of the words is vigorously repudiated by others; but it is a general opinion, and arises out of setting aside the article, and treating ὁ μεσίτης, to use Alford's explanation, as 'generic, which does not belong to one party (masc.), but to two, as going between one party and another.'

The Dean of Chester, in the 'Speaker's Commentary,' quotes with approval from an unpublished sermon by the Rev. Canon Evans, of Durham, as follows:

> Some two or three hundred interpretations go upon the misconception that the meaning is, A mediator is a mediator not of one party, but of two parties, and God is one of these two parties. This is, I strongly suspect, quite a mistake; the structure of the Greek excludes it. The word 'one' clearly points not to *number*, but *quality*; and so the sense will be: A mediator has nothing to do with what is one, whatsoever be the number of individuals constituting that unit, but God is pre-eminently ONE—one with Himself. As in essence, so in will . . . one in His own method of dealing with all.

I may not rightly apprehend the drift of this, but it seems to me to introduce into the argument a totally irrelevant consideration.

On the other side, Dr. Sanday, in 'Bishop Ellicott's Commentary,' writes: 'The very idea of a mediator

involves two parties at least. The Law had a mediator: therefore the Law involves two parties. In other respects it is a covenant. On the other hand, God, the giver of the promise, stands alone, therefore the promise is *not* a contract, and resting on God is indefeasible.' He had previously said: 'When there is a contract, there must be also conditions, and if these conditions are not observed, the whole falls to the ground. Such was the Law. The Law was not kept, and therefore the blessings annexed to it were forfeited. On the other hand, the promise depends upon God alone. He gave, and He will assuredly keep it, no matter what man may do. God alone is concerned in it.' Further, of this interpretation he says: 'At the present moment there is a tendency to acquiesce in that given above, which, it is hoped, will be thought satisfactory.' Dr. Sanday is evidently not sure of the ground on which he stands.

Lightfoot maintains that Moses is the mediator, and that he fulfils the conditions of St. Paul's argument. He states, however, that Origen—and a vast number of later commentators following him—maintained that the mediator is Christ, being misled, he says, by 1 Tim. ii. 5, and that, much earlier than Origen, Marcion would seem to have entertained this view.

Of verse 20 he gives an interpretation of which he is not so sure, but which 'appears to him the most probable.' He translates thus: 'No mediator can be a mediator of one,' thus giving the most general reference of the passage possible. He adds: 'The very idea of mediation supposes two persons at least, between whom the mediation is carried on.' The two powers here are, 'God on the one hand, and the Jewish people on the other.'

All this proceeds on the ignoring of the article, and consequent giving an indefinite sense to ὁ μεσίτης. But if we give its due place and weight to the article, we shall

translate thus: 'In the hand of a mediator. Now, *this* mediator is not *the mediator* of one.' We thus identify ὁ μεσίτης with μεσίτου as one and the same Being.

Lightfoot notices the article in this way: 'The definite article with μεσίτης expresses the idea, the specific type.' Is not this view negatived by the close connection between μεσίτου and μεσίτης? As we read, 'a mediator. Now (or but) this mediator.' We have a similar instance of this use of the article in James ii. 14, where a certain faith is specified, followed by μὴ δύναται ἡ πίστις σῶσαι αὐτόν; 'Can that faith save him?' (R.V.).

Referring to Origen's view, and that of the vast number of ancient expositors, that the mediator is Christ, Dr. Sanday remarks they 'were thus thrown out in their interpretation of the whole passage.' Is this so certain as to justify the statement? Were they wrong? Some argument has been had recourse to in proof that Moses is the mediator; perhaps it is more correct to say that of late it has been confidently and generally assumed, and some show of argument advanced in its favour. And there are some grounds for it. The circumstances were these: God Himself prepared the first two tables of stone on which he wrote the Law, the ten commandments. Thus given, there was nothing to characterize it but strict unbending justice. Its language was: This do, and live; transgress, and die. Mercy was altogether alien to it; no forgiveness for any, even the slightest violation. Israel transgressed. 'They made them gods of gold.' Moses descended from the Mount with the Law in his hands. He beheld the idolatry; he saw that under that law the people were condemned; no mercy could be extended to them; therefore he dashed the tables from his hands and broke them beneath the Mount. It was not the result of momentary passion; it was a deliberate act. Under the Law so given the people could not live; the Covenant was at an end.

On the morrow Moses returned unto the Lord, and said, 'Oh! the people have sinned a great sin, and have made them gods of gold; yet now, if Thou will forgive their sins, and if not, blot me I pray Thee out of Thy book which Thou hast written.' Here, I presume, we may consider Moses acting as a mediator. But can this fulfil the statement that the law was administered in the hand of a mediator?

In what sense are we to understand the words 'in the hand'? In the 'Speaker's Commentary' we read: 'It (the Law) was not given directly, but through the intervention of angels, and it was placed in the hands of a mediator, who is Moses.' Are we to understand 'placed in the hands' to be the exposition of ἐν χειρὶ—in the hand? In Exodus xxxii. 15, it is said that Moses 'went down from the Mount, and the two tables of the testimony were in his hands;' and Moses himself said, 'I came down from the Mount, and the Mount burned with fire. And the two tables of the Covenant were in my two hands' (Deut. ix. 15). On his first receiving the tables he was not acting in any sense as a mediator. His mediation only commenced after the first tables were broken. Yet on both occasions it was the moral precepts of the Law, the ten commandments, that were placed in his hands. Can this satisfy the statement that God's moral law was administered in the hand of a mediator? 'In the hand' surely must mean in the power of; as we read of Elijah (and others): 'the hand,' *i.e.*, the power, 'of the Lord was on him.' Can we conceive, otherwise than in type and figure, God's moral law administered by any being save Himself, God in Christ? The words, moreover, imply a constant and continued administration of the Law. This evidently occurred to Lightfoot, for he remarks: 'The reference in St. Paul seems to be to the first giving of the Law; if extended to its after-administration the μεσίτης would then be the High Priest; but

the extension does not seem to be contemplated here. He is not quite certain; he can only say 'seems to be'—'does not seem to be.' But why? Do the words insinuate the thought that, after all, Moses might not have been the mediator?

Moses, like all other officers of the law, was typical, a typical mediator, and it was as such that he 'hewed out two tables of stone like unto the first,' on which God wrote the ten commandments the second time; and being thus prepared by, and placed in the hands of Moses as such mediator in type, a halo of mercy surrounded the Law, and forgiveness for transgression was possible. And as the lamb, whose blood was offered in atonement for sinners, was the type of 'the Lamb of God,' and the blood was the blood of propitiation, yet only in type, for no blood but that of the Christ Himself was the real blood of propitiation; so was Moses only in name a mediator, the true Mediator being the Christ, even the Mediator of the Law; ever, too, its Administrator among the people, and not merely when first delivered to Moses.

This view is confirmed by the words following, *ὁ δὲ μεσίτης ἑνὸς οὐκ ἔστιν*, 'Now this mediator is not of one,' that is, giving its weight to the article. The question now forces itself on us, the mediator of one—what? We get our answer from what precedes. The Apostle writes to establish the complete deliverance of God's people from the bondage of the Law, as delivered on Sinai. He does this by reference to the standing of Abraham. Abraham was in the Gospel Covenant. The inheritance was his by promise. St. Paul designates this promise a covenant, and a covenant is a contract. This fact I find almost entirely overlooked by commentators, who deal exclusively with the promise character of the Abrahamic dispensation, even contrasting promise with covenant or contract. Yet Paul writes, 'though it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth, or

addeth thereto. Now, to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. . . . And this I say, that the covenant that was confirmed before by God, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, so as to make the promise of none effect.' Here promise and covenant are used interchangeably ; the promise was a covenant, and the covenant was a promise.

In various comments the Law is spoken of as a parenthesis. But the users of this most suitable designation seem to forget that on the termination of a parenthesis, as a matter of course, the former state is resumed. Here the Covenant of the Gospel was before the Law, and it succeeds it ; and it had a Mediator from the first, and that Mediator was Christ ; for the Gospel, resumed after the parenthesis, is spoken of as a covenant with a Mediator ; 'He (Christ) is the Mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises.' (Heb. viii. 6). Now, these promises are those made to Abraham. The covenant established on these promises preceded and succeeded the parenthesis of the Law ; its Mediator was, and is, Christ. There could not be two mediators in the one covenant, the one Gospel, the one promise. Any attempt to contrast the Promise with the Law, and to say, while the Law as a covenant has two parties, the promise has only one, and that one is God, is futile with the Apostle's argument before us.

As well as the Gospel is a covenant, so is the Law, and it also must have its Mediator, and Christ is the Mediator, not of one covenant only, but of both, not of that only which preceded and succeeded the parenthesis, but of the covenant of the parenthesis too ; and it was in His hand, as its true, not typical, mediator that the Law was administered. 'Now, this mediator is not the mediator of one covenant only, but of both.' The Apostle's statement comes to this, as he expresses it to Timothy, 'There is one Mediator between God and man, a man, *even*

Christ Jesus' (or, Christ Jesus, who is Himself a man). It is not very clear why Lightfoot remarks, 'It will be seen that St. Paul's argument here (Gal. iii. 19, 20) rests in effect on our Lord's Divinity as its foundation. Otherwise he would have been a mediator in the same sense in which Moses was a mediator. In another and a higher sense, St. Paul himself so speaks of our Lord (1 Tim. ii. 5).'*

Of the words immediately connected with those we have been considering, ὁ δὲ Θεὸς εἷς ἐστίν, we have two renderings in the A.V.: in Galatians, 'God is one;' in James ii. 19, 'There is one God.' I do not see that anyone positively asserts that the latter is an incorrect rendering, but all writers say, 'rather, God is one.' The R.V. adopts a different reading, as does Alford—εἷς ἐστὶν ὁ Θεός, 'God is one.' Alford's reading is somewhat different, but with the same rendering, εἷς ὁ Θεὸς ἐστίν. The R.V., in margin, εἷς Θεὸς ἔστι, 'There is one God;' so Alford in his notes *in loco*. If we could fairly translate Galatians as James is translated in A.V., we should have between the two parts of our passage, in another form, St. Paul's declaration to Timothy, already partly quoted: 'There is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, a man, *Who is*, Christ Jesus.' Notwithstanding

* A difficulty is suggested by ἑνὸς being either masculine or neuter, while διαθήκη is feminine. The reason to me is obvious; both genders could not have been expressed, and νόμος, the last named, rules ἑνὸς. 'Now God is one,' or 'Now there is one God' (both express the truth of God's unity), are alike in meaning. 'The Lord our Elohim is one Jehovah' (Deut. vi. 4). The necessity for asserting the unity of God arises from this, that it might be admitted that there is only one Mediator, and at the same time it be asserted that He is the Mediator between man and the many gods of the Gentiles. Hence one Mediator and one God; the unity of the Mediator and the unity of God being mutually dependent upon, and establishing, each other. If ἑνὸς be considered neuter, it is so, as embracing both genders, since both could not have been expressed.

some slight difficulty—if any, it is only slight—which may stand in the way of so rendering Galatians, I cannot but think that the same idea underlies both the sayings of St. Paul. At the same time, I must add that, whichever of the two is the more correct rendering, there is no ground for the interpretation that God is one of the parties with whom the Mediator has to deal; this is not in the words before us. 'God is one.' A distinction has been asserted between the two forms of expression. 'God is one,' it is said, is against polytheism; 'There is one God,' against atheism. Is there this distinction? On the contrary, are not both alike against polytheism? 'God is one,' and not many; 'There is one God,' and not many—one only true God. The natural formula against atheism is, 'There is a God;' nay, even 'There are Gods,' be they many or few, alike negatives the atheism which says, 'There is no God.'

A few additional observations on the relative standings of the people of God before, while under, and since the Law, will not be out of place, as strengthening my position. The Church in the Abrahamic dispensation, I have before remarked, was in a similar relationship to the Law to that of the Church since the advent of Christ—the Church in the present dispensation. It was under the Gospel, as we are. All the spiritual promises made to Abraham were made to him as 'the father of many nations,' and while he was yet 'in uncircumcision . . . that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be in uncircumcision, that righteousness might be reckoned unto them.' The Church had its Mediator while in uncircumcision and when in circumcision, and that Mediator could have been no other than Christ. It would require a very clear revelation to lead us to believe that four hundred and thirty years after—that is, after Christ had been the Mediator of the Church for that period, at its close He was superseded by Moses,

and that again He resumed the office when the dispensation of the Law had passed away. The Law was a type in all its officers and ordinances; but the reality lay behind it. Gentile Christians, as well as Jewish, are identified with Abraham as his seed in what I may call the summary given in Gal. iii. 29: 'If ye are Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise;'—in accord with Rom. iv. 13, 'For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or his seed, through the Law, but through the righteousness of faith.'

By a homely and telling illustration St. Pau explains the different standings of the Church under the Law and under the Gospel. The knowledge of sin and righteousness having been lost, God deemed it needful to put His people under the instruction and discipline of a pedagogue; hence the Law as that pedagogue. The training was to continue only for a time. The illustration is in the fourth chapter of this Epistle: 'The heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a bondslave, though he be lord of all.' He is at school during his minority, but as soon as he reaches his majority he is freed from the restraints of 'tutors and governors,' and enters on the enjoyment of his inheritance. The Apostle draws the parallelism, 'Even so we, when we were children, were in bondage under the elements of the world'—that is, under the Law. But the Church came of age at the advent of God's Son; hence, 'Thou art no more a bondslave, but a son.' There is much that is remarkable in this. St. Paul identifies himself and all Jewish believers with the Gentile Christians as one Church, one from the beginning: 'We,' the Church, were under the bondage of the Law; 'Thou,' the Gentile believers (the Galatians as a portion of them) art no longer in bondage. How could such language be addressed to Gentile believers, save on the great fact that there is, and has always been, only one

Church, one and the same in the days of Abraham, when under the Law, and in the present dispensation?

The Church is thus presented in different circumstances; similarly as the heir is first a slave, then a free man; not two men, but one in different states—the one Church, however different at times its conditions, however changed its constituents. The Church of all ages, 'the Holy Church throughout all the world,' was, and is, the Church of Abraham. Hence 'we' were under the Law; 'thou' art no longer under it; 'we' (the Church) were bond-slaves; 'thou' (the Church) art now free. It matters not that the constituents of the Church were at one time all Israelites, and that now they include both Jews and Gentiles.

The conclusion to which all my reasoning leads is, in the words of St. Paul to Timothy, quoted in a previous part of this paper, *εἷς Θεὸς, εἷς καὶ μεσίτης Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, ἄνθρωπος, χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς*; one God, one Mediator also between God and men—men of every age and every nationality—that Mediator a man; that man Christ Jesus.

WE HAVE AN ALTAR.

(Heb. xiii. 10-12.)

On the first part of this passage, 'we have an altar,' Dean Alfold gives a summary of the many different interpretations known to him. It may be well to specify them briefly:

1. He writes: 'Some have said that no distinct idea was before him (the writer of the Epistle), but that he merely used the term *altar* to keep the figure he was about to introduce, and this view has just so much truth in it, that there is no emphasis on *θυσιαστήριον*: it is not *θυσιαστήριον ἔχομεν*.' This is a valuable remark of the Dean's, and one to be always borne in mind in our interpretation of the words.

2. 'Others understand by the altar *Christ Himself*.' But, I ask, How could the victim be the altar on which it was itself offered?

3. 'Some understand *the table of the Lord*, at which we eat the Lord's Supper.' I remark, This view arises from two misconceptions: one, that the pronoun 'we' in our English translation refers to Christians, *we Christians have an altar*, as distinguished from Jews, whereas there is no pronoun in the Greek; on the importance of this I shall enlarge further on; the other misconception, a baseless assumption, is that the elements of bread and wine are

offered on the table as a sacrifice. Hence the anomalous expression 'Altar-cloths.' Who ever heard of a cloth being laid on an altar in either pagan or Jewish ritual? To this also I shall again refer.

Alford's own view is, 'that the Altar is the Cross of Christ on which the Lord suffered.' The answer to this too generally held view I give from the 'Speaker's Commentary.' Dr. William Kay, the writer, says, 'It cannot be the cross, that was the instrument by which our Lord's death was effected: but so far was it from being as the altar which sanctifieth the gift, that it stands as the outward symbol of the curse pronounced by the law (Gal. iii. 23) upon the malefactor. The cross was as little the altar as the Roman soldiers were priests.' I may add, or as the knife by which the victim was slain was the altar on which that victim was offered.

The Commentary goes on to say, 'nor yet can it be understood of *the Lord's table*. It is, of course, true to say that they who continued to serve the tabernacle had no right to partake of the Lord's Supper, and if verse 10 had stood alone, this might have been what it asserted.' The writer seems strangely to have forgotten that the tabernacle service had centuries gone by ceased altogether, and that at the time the Epistle was written there were none 'who continued to serve the tabernacle.' Dr. Kay's own opinion is that the Altar is 'Christ's own Divine-human personality.' But this is too transcendental.

I must now refer to the late Bishop Lightfoot, whose view varied at times, and was far from being at any time established.* He writes: 'It is surprising that some should have interpreted *θυσιαστήριον* in Heb. xiii. 10, "of the Lord's table." In my former editions I interpreted *θυσιαστήριον* of "the congregation assembled for worship," but I have since been convinced that the context points

* 'The Christian Ministry,' pp. 265, 266, note, seventh edition.

to the Cross of Christ spiritually considered as the true interpretation.' Referring then to the opinion of more than one writer, he says: 'It is maintained that ἔχομεν θυσιαστήριον should be understood, "We Jews have an altar."' This view he considers 'attractive, but inadequate to explain the whole context,' and is ill-adapted to individual expressions, not to mention that the first person plural and the present tense ἔχομεν seem unnatural, when the author and his readers are spoken of, not as natural Christians, but as former Jews.

Again, referring to the opinion, that by altar the Lord's table is intended, the Bishop writes: 'Some interpreters, from a comparison of 1 Cor. ix. 13 with 1 Cor. x. 16, have inferred that St. Paul recognises the designation of the Lord's table as an altar. On the contrary, it is a speaking fact, that in both passages he avoids using this term of the Lord's table, though the language of the context might readily have suggested it to him if he had considered it appropriate; nor does the argument in either case require or encourage such an inference. In 1 Cor. ix. 13 the Apostle writes, "Know ye not that they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar? Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel." The point of resemblance in the two cases is the holding a sacred office, but the ministering on the altar is predicated only of the former. So also in 1 Cor. x, 18 *sq.*, the altar is named as common to Jews and heathens, *i.e.*, the Holy Eucharist is a banquet, but it is not a sacrifice (in the Jewish or heathen sense of sacrifice).'

I repeat Lightfoot's words, 'it is surprising that some should have interpreted θυσιαστήριον in Heb. xiii. 10, "of the Lord's table."' 'Surprising' indeed, only we know that men bent on propping up an untenable position will go to any lengths. 'Surprising,' for there is nothing in the epistle from first to last referring to the Lord's

Supper, and more especially in the context of the verse. But when men have made up their minds that they will offer a propitiatory sacrifice for sin, or, at least, that they will have some part in the one sacrifice of our Lord, they readily seize on the words 'we have an altar,' irrespectively altogether of the context, as affording some colour for their determination; and this without any proof in the whole New Testament; or any argument I have ever heard, except, if it can be called argument, some abstract conception that such ought to be, and then the school-boy conclusion, that such is. It is in this way that the passages in 1 Cor. ix. and x. are handled to prove that the Lord's table is an altar. It is assumed that St. Paul in these passages ought to have employed the term altar instead of table, therefore altar and table are interchangeable, and finally, therefore, table means altar.

It is many years since my opinion was formed that the writer of the epistle refers to the tabernacle altar in connection with the great day of atonement. I arrived at this opinion in the following way: It is admitted on all hands that the author is explaining the evangelical teaching of the tabernacle service, which service, however, had ceased many centuries before; yet in his explanation he uses the present tense. In chapter ix. the tabernacle itself is first described with its ordinances; and then we read (R.V.): 'Now these things having been thus prepared, the priests go in continually into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the services; but into the second the high-priest alone, once in the year, not without blood, which he offereth for himself, and for the errors of the people: the Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the holy place hath not yet been made manifest, while as the first tabernacle is yet standing; which is a parable for the time now present; according to which are offered both gifts and sacrifices that cannot, as touching the conscience, make the worshipper perfect, being only . . .

carnal ordinances, imposed until a time of reformation.' (verses 6-10). The Apostle has before his mind the whole tabernacle service as enjoined in the Book of the Law, and writes as if he saw it all carried out. We ourselves constantly use the present tense when speaking of the past.

When my mind fully grasped the importance of this, I applied the principle to the exegesis of the passage before us. Its statements are in the present tense: 'We have an altar—they which serve the tabernacle—bodies are burned, blood is brought.' As if the writer said: 'I see in the tabernacle service an altar, whereof the servers of the tabernacle—priests, Levites, porters, all who wait on the altar—have no power to eat, for the all-sufficient reason, that the entire bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the holy place, by the high-priest, for sin, are burned without the camp.' Should we not translate ἐξ ὃν *from off which*, and ἐξουσιάν *power?*—ability, not title.*

This led me to conclude that ἔχομεν is a technical expression, as the words 'we have' are with us, whose import is, *there is* or *there are*, and that we should understand the words as, *there is an altar—i.e.*, in the service. I examined the use of the word in the New Testament, and found it to occur forty-five times; and in most of these, if not in all—except in three, if not in four cases—no emphasis necessarily appertains to the pronoun 'we'—at least such is the rule, whatever exceptions there may be. And the present instance cannot be an exception, as, at the time the epistle was written, the altar was non-existent, having passed away with the cessation of the tabernacle service.

In the three exceptions referred to the pronoun is expressed—ἡμεῖς ἔχομεν. Thus in John xix. 7, Ἡμεῖς

* In Westcott and Hort's revised Greek New Testament, ἐξουσίαν is in brackets.

νόμον ἔχομεν, 'We (Jews) have a law.' In 1 Cor. ii. 16, *Ἡμεῖς δὲ νοῦν ἔχομεν*, We (Apostles). Similarly in xi. 16, *ἡμεῖς τοιαύτην συνήθειαν οὐκ ἔχομεν*, We (Apostles). The fourth case is peculiar, John viii. 41, *Ἡμεῖς ἐκ πορνείας οὐκ ἐγεννήθημεν* (R.V.), *ἕνα πατέρα ἔχομεν, τὸν Θεόν*, 'We have one Father, God.' We (Jews). Here the *ἡμεῖς* is evidently understood, brought forward from the previous verb; it belongs to both verbs.

I may instance two other cases, though in each the construction is different. Acts xxi. 23, 'We have four men,' *εἰσὶν ἡμῖν ἄνδρες τέσσαρες*; 1 Cor. viii. 6, 'To *us* there is one God,' *ἡμῖν εἷς Θεὸς*. In both these the pronoun is specific. In most other instances, as I have already said, *ἔχομεν* by itself has the meaning of *there is*, or *there are*. I cite a verse or two. Matt. xxvi. 65, 'What further need have we of witnesses?' This may be read, and it is what it means, What further need is there of witnesses? 1 John ii. 1, 'If any man sin we have an Advocate.' This is slipshod English. Correct language would be, 'If any man sin, he has an Advocate.' But read, 'There is an Advocate,' and all is correct as a translation.

Dr. Kay, in the 'Speaker's Commentary,' in a passage already quoted, says: 'It is, of course, true to say that they who continued to serve the tabernacle had no right to partake of the Lord's Supper.' Here is a fine specimen of confusion of language. The writer in his thought, unconsciously no doubt, substitutes *temple* for *tabernacle*, forgetting that servitors of the tabernacle had ceased to be, ages before the epistle was written, so that there were none 'who continued to serve the tabernacle' at the time.* But, passing this, is it 'of course true to say' that they who were serving the temple were not entitled to partake of the Lord's Supper? We are told that

* Westcott acts similarly in his exposition, which all proceeds on this strange substitution.

'many thousands—tens of thousands—of the Jews believed, and were all zealous of the law'; and no doubt among them were counted the 'great company of the priests that were obedient to the faith.' Paul himself was made prisoner when observing the law in the temple, waiting until 'the offering was offered for everyone of them,' himself and his four companions (Acts xxi. 26). It is utterly inconceivable that these many thousands, including the priests and Paul himself, were not entitled to partake of the Lord's Supper. This consideration furnishes one of the strongest arguments, if not the strongest, against the conception that by the altar of our passage we are to understand the Lord's table. This is strengthened by the word 'camp'—'the bodies are burned without the camp'—all proving that the reference is to the tabernacle service of the Israelites when encamped in the wilderness, and not in any respect to the temple service, as in the days of the Apostles. There is consequently no contrast or opposition between altar and tabernacle, but perfect agreement, and hence no opposition intended between *altar*, interpreted to be the *Lord's table*, and *tabernacle*, interpreted to be *the temple*. It may be well, for clearness' sake, to repeat that any asserted opposition is purely imaginative, and contrary to the teaching of the Scriptures, as the believing Jews took part in both services—that of the temple and that of the Lord's Supper; while the believing Gentiles took part only in the latter.

The doctrine of the service, or services, on the great day of Atonement is elucidated by, as well as elucidating, the parallelism drawn between the mode of the victim's death and that of our Lord. The body of the former, as being considered altogether unclean, was brought without the camp and wholly consumed in an unclean place: thus in type suffering the penalty of sin, borne by itself, alone. So, 'Jesus suffered without the gate.' He was crucified

in the unclean place where the Romans were wont to crucify their condemned. 'He bore our sins in His own body up to the tree,' and there paid the full penalty thereof—alone.

The full penalty of sin is banishment from God's presence for ever. If in His 'presence is the fulness of joy and pleasures for evermore,' in absence from Him is the fulness of misery. St. Jude illustrates this by a striking simile: 'Wandering stars for whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever;' planets that have broken from their orbits, wandering off into illimitable space, where no light or heat of the sun can reach them; death for ever their lot; never to return to their orbits. So Jesus felt the fulness of this misery when forsaken by His Father. The iron entered into His soul; it was coldness; it was darkness; it was death; the terrible curse rested upon Him; and from His inmost soul was wrung the cry of deepest anguish, 'My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?' Why? The answer is, As the Lamb of God He bore the sin of the world; He must needs pay the full penalty thereof.

In language altogether different, and so bold that we should hesitate to use it, did we not find it in the Scriptures, St. Paul in his Epistle to the Galatians (chapter iii.) teaches the same truth. He quotes from Deuteronomy (xxvii. 26): 'Cursed is everyone that continueth not in all things that are written in the book of the law to do them.' This curse is the full penalty. He then declares the glad tidings of deliverance from the curse: 'Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us, as it is written, Cursed is everyone that hangeth on a tree.' The cross, or stake, being an accursed thing in God's sight, everyone impaled on the cursed thing became thereby accursed, on the principle, that whosoever touched a dead body, became thereby defiled. Christ thus, as it were, intercepted the

curse that else should have fallen on us, becoming thereby 'a curse for us.'

In the examination of our passage we should not overlook the statement that 'Jesus suffered without the gate, that He might sanctify the people through (διὰ) His own blood.' The doctrine of the blood thus requires consideration. We find this doctrine in the prohibition to eat blood, and, as the reason for the prohibition, 'For the life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life' (Lev. xvii. 11, R.V.). Here are three statements to be carefully noted: 1. The blood is the life. 2. The blood maketh atonement for the soul. 3. The blood on the altar, not as poured out, but as offered on the altar; not dead blood, but living blood: that is, the life offered on the altar is the atonement for the soul.

From the first it was clearly revealed that 'death is by sin,' sin's penalty. 'In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die.' The life forfeited, the atonement must be another life, chargeable with no sin, substituted. This is taught in Leviticus i. in the case of the man who offereth an oblation unto the Lord: 'He shall lay his hand upon the head of the burnt offering; and it shall be accepted of him, to make atonement for him. And he shall kill the bullock before the Lord: and the priest's, Aaron's sons, shall present the blood, and sprinkle the blood round about upon the altar, that is at the door of the tent of meeting' (verses 4, 5). It is not said that in laying his hand on the bullock's head he transferred his sin to the bullock; he merely identified himself with the victim who was thus substituted for him, so that the victim's life—the blood upon the altar—would be accepted in lieu of the offerer's, an atonement for him.

More fully is all this taught in the ordinance of the great day of Atonement (Lev. xvi.) to which our passage

specially points. On that day the high-priest acted in a double capacity—as representative of the people to God, and as representative of God to the people. As the former, he killed 'the bullock of the sin offering, which is for himself,' and the goat of the 'sin offering that is for the people.' And as the latter, he laid 'both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confessed over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions, even all their sins: and he shall put them upon the head of the goat.' He took of the children of Israel two he-goats for a sin offering, the two being regarded as one. With the blood of the bullock, which was for himself, and with the blood of the goat, which was for the people, each at different times, he went within the vail, and sprinkled the blood upon and before the mercy seat, thus making the atonement: 'And there shall be no man in the tent of meeting, when he goeth to make atonement in the holy place, until he come out, and have made atonement for himself, and for his household, and for all the assembly of Israel.'

The complete effect of the atonement was symbolically declared by the subsequent proceeding. The goat to which all the sins of the people had been transferred was led into the wilderness and there let free, not to return, bringing back the sins from the land of oblivion. Thus was anticipated the terms of the new covenant, 'Their sins will I remember no more.'

All this met its fulfilment in our Lord. Thus Isaiah wrote (liii. 6), 'The Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all.' And the first testimony borne to Him after He entered on His ministry was this by John the Baptist: 'Behold the Lamb of God, Who beareth the sin of the world' (John i. 29, margin). And onward through His ministry He bore that load, until, as St. Peter expresseth it, 'Who His own self carried up our sins in His body to the tree' (1 Peter ii. 24, margin R.V.). Two con-

siderations here should not be overlooked: 1. Jehovah and Jesus are one, so that Jehovah laying our iniquity upon Him, was Jesus voluntarily assuming it. 2. Sickness, which is virtually death begun, is of the penalty of sin. When, therefore, our Lord healed diseases, He is stated to have taken them upon Himself, afterwards to pay the penalty on the cross, and there to offer the atonement in the presentation of His blood. Thus St. Matthew (viii. 16): 'He healed all that were sick, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Isaiah the prophet, saying, Himself took our iniquities and bare our diseases.' This is the doctrine of the blood—of the substituted life—according to the Scriptures.

To complete our consideration of the subject, we must now examine our Communion Office to see what is its teaching. In the first Prayer-Book of Edward the title of the service is, 'The Supper of the Lord, and the Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass.' In accordance with the Mass, we have Altar in the Rubrics. But when the Church advanced in the true conception of the Lord's Supper, all idea of a propitiatory sacrifice offered on the Lord's table was abandoned, and the terms *Mass* and *Altar* disappeared, and have not since been restored. In the second Prayer-Book of Edward the title is, as at present, 'The Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion.'

In a preliminary rubric it is enacted that 'the table at the Communion time having a fair white linen cloth upon it, shall stand in the body of the church, or in the chancel, where Morning and Evening Prayer are appointed to be said.'* There is more in this Rubric than at first meets the eye. When the table was regarded as an altar, no cloth was ordered to be laid upon it. I do not think it

* I quote this rubric as it was before our Irish revision, and as it is still in the Prayer-Book of the Church of England. We omit the words after chancel.

could ever have entered into the imagination of either Pagan or Jewish priest to have laid a cloth on an altar on which blood was sprinkled and sacrifices burned. Such an incongruity as 'altar cloths' was reserved for the day when the sow that was washed desires to return to her wallowing in the mire. 'A fair white linen cloth' excludes all symbols worked or woven in or upon it.

The place where the table is to stand during the administration is to be noted. 'In the body of the church (first specified and most prominent) or in the chancel;' the selection to be according to the saying of morning and evening prayer.* The table is to be

* 'Morning and evening prayer,' not 'matins and evensong,' words which are not once used in the Prayer-Book to designate our daily services. They occur only in the headings of the columns of Proper Lessons for Sundays and Holy Days, and of Proper Psalms; but yet the title of the table which specifies these lessons is, 'Proper Lessons to be Read at Morning and Evening Prayer,' etc. The words are absent from the Calendar, where we have all through 'Morning prayer,' 'Evening prayer'; or, as in our revised book, 'Morning,' 'Evening.' They are in abundance in the first Prayer-Book of Edward, but not once in the second, throughout which they were deliberately eliminated in every instance that had appeared in the first Prayer-Book. The absurdity of calling morning prayer 'matins' is striking, when we consider that matins began properly before daylight. They are found in the Act of Uniformity of Elizabeth (but not of Charles); it would seem, however, as if they had slipped in there inadvertently, as in the Prayer-book authorized by the Act there are no services so designated, and they were disregarded in every edition subsequently published, appearing only in the places I have specified; and strange places they are for such words, being inserted nowhere else in the Prayer-Book. Were it not for the title of the table, it would be impossible with any certainty, within the purview of the Prayer-Book, to determine to what services, authorized or unauthorized, 'matins and evensong' referred. No leal-hearted Churchman, rightly instructed, would deliberately use the words. They are the badge of a party; and anything more detrimental to the interests of the Church than badges of party, whether words or things, there can scarcely be. They are of the essence of schism. I feel more and more strongly every day that fealty to the Church demands of us that we should abide strictly

movable, not a fixed structure, as an altar. Now all this is opposed to the present-day fashion with some, of calling the chancel 'the sanctuary,' or 'the most eminent part of the church,' or some other, in this connection, equally anti-Church appellative. Whereas the entire building is the sanctuary of God, all of it alike consecrated to His service; the chancel no more than any other part, the east no more than the west. The truth is, that, whether consciously or unconsciously, underlying all this anti-Church proceeding is the heresy of transubstantiation and the idolatry of the Mass.*

Two rubrics immediately preceding the prayer for the Church Militant now claim our attention. The difference between them, which may be termed even dogmatic, has not met the consideration which it merits. The first gives instruction as to placing the 'alms for the poor and other devotions of the people' on the table. The second, as to placing the 'bread and wine.' These were added at the revision of 1662, from the Scotch office. The first rubric orders, 'the priest shall humbly present and place it (the basin in which the alms and other devotions were collected) upon the holy table.' In this rubric two things are ordered: 1, the basin is to be presented; 2, then placed upon the holy table. The second of our rubrics is, 'the priest shall then place upon the table so much bread and wine as he shall think sufficient.' No presentation, oblation, or offering up of the elements is ordered, as in the case of the alms and other devotions.

by the nomenclature and phraseology of our Prayer-Book, Articles, and Canons. If we do so there will be far fewer divisions among us.

* It is evident from the preliminary rubric that the Churches of England and Ireland make no special account of the chancel, where it is not only permitted, but ordered, that under the rule there laid down the administration of the Lord's Supper must take place in the body of the church.

The unconsecrated elements are not to be oblated.* The Scotch office enacts thus, 'the presbyter shall then offer up and place the bread and wine prepared for the Sacrament upon the Lord's table.' Deliberately from the rubric, when revised in 1662, the words 'offer up' were omitted; and further was omitted a prayer called 'the oblation,' in which occur these words, 'we do celebrate, and make here before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, WHICH WE NOW OFFER UNTO THEE, the memorial,' etc.†

A subsequent rubric enacts, 'If any of the bread and wine remain unconsecrated, the curate shall have it for his own use.' Would it not be strange, nay, even profane, for the curate to bring to his house, and share bread and wine that had been offered to God for so solemn a service, with any person that might happen to be in his house? The Scotch office has no provision for such an emergency. Notwithstanding the absence of any direction in this rubric, or elsewhere in our office, to

* The side-note to the prayer for the Church Militant is constantly strangely dealt with. When there is no Communion the word 'oblations' is left unsaid, and God is asked to accept our 'alms,' although no alms for the poor have been collected at the offertory and presented. Indeed, the word might be omitted altogether from the note, as very seldom, if ever, are alms for the poor now collected during the offertory. 'The other devotions of the people' (*e.g.*, for missionary purposes, Church sustentation, or similar objects) are collected and presented. These constitute the oblations, yet God is not asked to accept them at all. The words 'or (and) oblations,' were added in 1662, and can refer only to what was then, in addition to the alms, ordered to be presented. The former rubric ran thus: 'Then shall the churchwardens . . . gather the devotion of the people, and put the same into the poor man's box,' and the note specified only 'the alms.' Where 'the other devotions' was added to the rubric, 'oblations' was added to the note. The conclusion is irresistible.

† To the rubric at our recent revision we added the words, 'if this have not been already done,' in order to legalize the practice that had obtained of the sexton, or other person, placing the elements on the table before the commencement of service.

offer up the unconsecrated elements (or, I may say, in passing, the consecrated), some do not hesitate to speak of it as enjoining oblation. Thus, in the 'Directorium Anglicanum' we have, preceding the quotation of the rubric, the following, 'The oblation of bread and wine, commonly called the first oblation.' But of the rubric assigning to the curate for his own use any that is left of the unconsecrated bread and wine, though quoted, no further notice is taken.

In the prayer of consecration the nature and effect of the atonement, as offered by our Lord, are stated in unmistakable language: 'By His one oblation of Himself, once offered, He made a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world.' The words 'one' and 'once' are most emphatic. The one sacrifice once offered fully effected its object. 'He made;' it is a fact—an accomplished fact; it cannot be added to; it cannot be repeated—for either would declare the work to be imperfect, and therefore ineffective. 'Jesus Christ is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world.' In Heb. ix. 24-26 Christ's action is contrasted with that of the high-priest in his service in the tabernacle: 'Christ entereth not into a holy place made with hands, like a pattern to the true, but into heaven itself . . . Nor yet that He should offer Himself often, as the high-priest entereth into the holy place year by year with blood not his own; else must He often have suffered since the foundation of the world: but now once, at the end of the ages, hath He been manifested to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself.' Yes, once! This fact is the gospel of the grace of God, which is proclaimed unto sinners: They believe, and 'he that believeth hath everlasting life.'

The petition in the prayer is: 'Grant that we receiving these Thy creatures of bread and wine . . . may be partakers of His most blessed body and blood.' What do

these words import? We get the answer in the well-known rubric in connection with the communion of the sick, which provides for the impossibility of the sick man in certain cases receiving the Sacrament: 'The curate shall instruct him that if he do truly repent him of his sins, and steadfastly believe that Christ hath suffered death upon the cross for him, and shed His blood for his redemption, earnestly remembering the benefit he hath thereby, and giving him hearty thanks therefor, he doth eat and drink the body and blood of our Saviour Christ profitably to his soul's health, although he do not receive the Sacrament with his mouth.'

An explanatory document, entitled 'The Confession of the Christian Faith,' was drawn up immediately after the revision of 1662. It was appended to various editions of the Prayer-Book, printed both in England and Ireland. So printed, it may be regarded as, if not an authoritative document, at least a recognised exposition of the views of the revisers. I extract from an edition 'printed by John Field, printer to the University of Cambridge, Anno Dom. 1666. Cum privilegio.' After stating that the Church as visible hath three marks or tokens whereby it may be known, the Confession specifies as the third 'the Holy Sacraments—to wit, baptism and the Lord's Supper.' It then explains the nature of the Sacraments. Of the Lord's Supper it says: 'The Supper declareth that God, as a most provident Father, doth not only feed our bodies, but also spiritually nourisheth our souls with the graces and benefits of Jesus Christ, which the scripture calleth eating of His flesh and drinking of His blood.'

The note on the rubric in the communion of the sick, in the 'Directorium Anglicanum,' is as follows: The very same provision occurs in the pre-Reformation service books: *Deinde communicatur infirmus nisi prius communicatus fuerit, et nisi de vomitu, vel alia irreverentia probabiliter timeatur: in quo casu dicat Sacerdos infirmo; Frater in*

hoc casu sufficit tibi vera fides, et bona voluntas; tantum crede et manducasti.' These few words, *crede et manducasti*, contain the essence of, and are the true explanation of our Lord's teaching in John vi.: 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, ye have not life in yourselves' (ζωὴν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς), and this, independently of the peculiar circumstances specified in the rubric or in 'The Anglican Directory.' Our Lord spoke first negatively, then affirmatively: 'Whoso eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood hath eternal life' (ζωὴν αἰώνιον), thus identifying ζωὴ αἰώνιος with ζωὴ ἐν ἑαυτῷ; and ζωὴ ἐν ἑαυτῷ is immortality, essential life. Immediately before, without any figure, He had said, in the simplicity of language: 'He that believeth on Me hath everlasting life.' Why? Because of that *one* and *once* offered sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world, when He offered up His life's blood for the forfeited life of the world. He thus fulfilled in every particular the typical teaching of the tabernacle service, to which these verses in the Epistle to the Hebrews so pointedly refer, and in elucidating which I have shown the perfect accord that exists between the teaching of our Communion office and the teaching of the Scriptures as concentrated in Heb. xiii. 10-12.

HADES.

WHAT is Hades? From the Homily on Prayer I make the following extracts: 'The Scripture doth acknowledge but two places after this life, the one proper to the elect and blessed of God.' 'St. Augustine doth only acknowledge two places after this life, heaven and hell. As for the third place, he doth plainly deny that there is any such to be found in all Scripture.' After quoting certain passages of the Scriptures, and of the early writers, the sermon adds: 'As the Scripture teacheth us, let us think that the soul of man, passing out of the body, goeth straightways either to heaven or else to hell.'* Now, the teaching of the Church as regards the Homilies, is that they 'contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times' (Art. XXXV.). The Church has not altered this doctrine. The doctrine that was 'godly and wholesome' some 200 years ago, cannot be otherwise at any time: it cannot change its character. As to the necessity 'for these times,' we might have fondly hoped that no such necessity does or could exist at present, were it not that indications abound on every side that such teaching is an absolute necessity, when men are advocating, what I hope I do not miscall, a vast subterranean reformatory for the wicked after death; a third place, distinct from heaven and hell, into which, it is maintained, the souls of all men go on death. This place

* Pp. 355, 356, edition S.P.C.K., 1864.

is called Hades, and it is described as being divided into two parts, separated the one from the other by a great chasm, and that there can be no passing from the one to the other, but that the souls dwelling in them respectively can see one another, and even converse. One of these divisions is called Paradise, and Abraham's bosom; the other, what? I cannot find out. One writer tells us that it is 'the baneful side of Hades.' Another, that it 'is not Gehenna.' Whence has arisen this idea of a third place, of which the Scriptures know nothing, and of the existence of which St. Augustine 'doth plainly deny that there is any such to be found in all Scripture'? the only answer is, paganism. The Jews derived the idea, like many others, from their pagan surroundings, and we from them, or, indeed, even direct from the pagans themselves. Early in the Christian era, the Church and the State combined, christened paganism, and in so doing paganized Christianity.

Hades is, however, a reality, not as a *place*, but a *state*. Its meaning, 'unseen,' is fitly represented by the old Saxon word of the same meaning, 'Hell.' We must carefully distinguish between these two, *state* and *place;* they are frequently confounded, as if there were no real distinction between them. On death the soul of everyone is in Hades, in the unseen state; the place of its dwelling until the resurrection is an altogether different idea. If the souls of the unbelieving dead are in conscious existence, I can only believe that they are in Gehenna. But are they in conscious existence? Old Testament Scripture is silent as to the intermediate state, as one of conscious existence. It connects the future life altogether with the resurrection. It speaks of our Lord's soul being in Sheol, which answers to Hades, but Sheol is used for the grave in Psalm cxli. 7, 'Our bones are scattered at Sheol's mouth.' And it is said of Korah, and all his company, that they went down alive into Sheol, with

their tents and household goods, even all that appertained unto them. By no possibility can we conceive that Sheol here specifies a place where the souls of the dead are confined. So far as Old Testament revelation is concerned, we can entertain no other opinion than that on death man sleeps in an unconscious state until wakened by the trumpet-call of the resurrection.

When we come to the New Testament we find, as we shall see, sufficient evidence, yet not overwhelming, that the souls of the righteous dead are, while in the intermediate state, in 'joy and felicity'—conscious existence of course. Of the souls of the unrighteous dead we are left in the same ignorance as in the case of the Old Testament. The only passage that ever is, or could be, adduced in this reference is our Lord's narrative of the rich man and Lazarus. How little this applies I shall further on consider. I shall here extract from Bullinger's 'Critical Lexicon and Concordance of the English and Greek New Testament':

> ἅδης. Hades, the invisible. Gravedom. Greek for Hebrew Sheol, which denotes a hollow abyss or cavity, as does the old English word Hell, or hole. Hades therefore denotes the realm of the invisible, Graveland, Gravedom. All the graves of the world viewed as one. The one Grave of the human race, not the grave of an individual. Acts ii. 24-34 is quoted from Ps. xvi., and refers only to Christ's burial.

With regard to our Lord's promise to the robber on the cross, our interpretation will depend on the way in which we read the words. Shall we connect the words 'to-day' with the verb 'I say' or with the promise as to Paradise? Shall we read, 'Verily to thee I say to-day, Thou shalt be with Me in Paradise:' or, 'Verily to thee I say, To-day thou shalt be with Me in Paradise'? The latter is the reading both of the A.V. and the R.V. In reference to the former, I quote again from Bullinger:

> Paradise. The later Jewish teaching made Paradise that part of ἅδης, reserved for the blessed. But ἅδης is Gravedom, whither

all go on death, and Paradise is the place of the risen saints. The Scripture teaches that Paradise was the dwelling-place of God with men in the first heaven and earth. It was barred from man at the Fall, and destroyed at the Flood. It will reappear again at the regeneration (Matt. xix. 28), when God shall fulfil His promise, and make the new heavens and earth (Isa. li. 16, lxv. 17, lxvi. 22; 2 Pet. iii. 13; Rev. xxii.), of which the millennial earth will be at once the pledge and foretaste. Hence the Scriptures relating to Paradise now, are all future, as the abode of *risen* saints, not of *dead* ones. (1) In Luke xxiii. 43 the Lord gives the dying robber a present *assurance*, instead of a *future remembrance*—'Verily I say unto thee to-day'—the *future* fulfilment being required by the absence of ὅτι (compare Luke xxii. 34 and Matt. xxi. 28 with Mark xiv. 30, Luke iv. 21, and xix. 9). (2) In 2 Cor. xii. 4 the verb is ἁρπάζω—'catch away,' *not* 'up.' (3) In Rev. ii. 7 the promise is clearly future, pointing to Rev. xxii.

As to σήμερον—to-day, this day—Bullinger states the rule as to its use:

When it comes after a verb, it belongs to that verb, unless it is separated from it, and thrown into the next clause by the presence of ὅτι (that); *e.g.* WITH ὅτι: Luke xix. 9, Εἶπε δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι σήμερον—'But Jesus said unto him, that to-day' (or, this day is salvation come, etc.); Luke iv. 21, ἤρξατο δὲ λέγειν πρὸς αυτοὺς ὅτι σήμερον—'But He began to say unto them, that this day' (or, to-day is this Scripture fulfilled, etc.); Mark xiv. 30, καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, ὅτι σήμερον, etc.)—'And Jesus saith unto him, Verily I say unto thee, that this day' *i.e.*, to-day, before the cock crow, etc.).

WITHOUT ὅτι: Matt. xxi. 28, καὶ, προσελθὼν τῷ πρώτῳ εἶπε. τέκνον, ὕπαγε σήμερον ἐργάζου ἐν τῷ ἀμπελῶνι μου, etc.—'And coming to the first, He said, Son, *go to-day*, work in My vineyard;' Luke xxii. 34, λέγω σοι, Πέτρε, οὐ μὴ φωνήσει σήμερον ἀλέκτωρ, etc.—'I tell thee, Peter, the cock shall not *crow this day*, before,' etc.; Luke xxiii. 43, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἀμήν σοι λέγω σήμερον, μετ' ἐμοῦ ἔσῃ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ—'And Jesus said to him, Verily to thee I *say this day*, with Me shalt thou be in the paradise.' The words *to-day* being made solemn and emphatic. Thus instead of *a remembrance* when He shall come in (ἐν, verse 42) His kingdom, He promises *a presence* then in association (μετά) with Himself. And this promise He makes on that very day when He was dying, but when the faith of the dying robber read aright the inscription above Him and the signs around Him. . . . We place this passage in harmony with numberless passages in the Old Testament—such as, 'Verily I say unto you this day,' etc.; 'I testify

unto you this day,' etc.; Deut. vi. 6, vii. 11, viii. 1, x. 13, xi. 8, 13, 18, xix. 9, xxvii. 4, xxx. 2, etc., where the Septuagint corresponds to Luke xxiii. 43.

Although a grammatical reason is assigned for this reading of our Lord's words, it meets with scant courtesy from Alford, who says, *in loco*: 'The attempt to join it with σοι λέγω, considering that it not only violates common-sense but destroys the force of our Lord's promise, is surely something worse than silly.' 'The Speaker's Commentary' remarks: 'An old but forced construction connects it (σήμερον) with the preceding words, "I say."' Bishop Ellicott's 'Commentary' passes over the construction without remark, though it evidently favours the reading of the A.V. and R.V.

The second place in the New Testament where Paradise is mentioned is 2 Cor. xii. 2-4. St. Paul informs the Corinthians that in vision he was 'caught up' (A.V. and R.V.), ἁρπαγέντα—caught away—ἕως τρίτου οὐρανοῦ—as far as the third heaven—'caught up'—caught away—εἰς τὸν παράδεισον—into the Paradise: combined we read, 'caught away as far as the third heaven, into the Paradise.' This can by no ingenuity be interpreted 'descended into Hades,' assumed, as it is, by some that Paradise is a region of that supposed place. St. Paul's statement implies either that the third heaven is identical with Paradise, or that Paradise is a region of that third heaven. Into this heaven ascended our Lord, and there abides 'until the times of the restitution—re-institution—restoration (R.V.) of all things.' And from thence 'He shall come again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead.'

The third mention of Paradise is in Rev. ii. 7: 'To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the Tree of Life—τῆς ζωῆς, the life—which is in the Paradise of God.' It is sufficient to say that the tree of the life is not in the region of death—it is not in Hades. This promise

stretches into that region of life where the saints will enjoy their everlasting life, when Death and Hades shall cease to be.

St. Paul's statements in 2 Cor. v. 6-8, and Phil. i. 23, respectively, now come under consideration. They are, 'knowing that while we are at home in the body we are absent from the Lord—willing rather to be absent from the body and present with the Lord' (R.V., at home). And, 'having a desire to depart and be with Christ, which is far better.' In the exposition of the passages in Corinthians, we must take into account the whole context with which they are connected. In the opening of the chapter, St. Paul contrasts the tabernacle of the present body with the habitation of the future. 'In this,' he writes, 'we groan, being burdened, longing to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven.' He then repudiates any wish to be disembodied, as in the words, 'Not that we would be—*οὐ θέλομεν*—unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality—*τὸ θνητὸν*—(R.V., what is mortal) may be swallowed up of life'—*ὑπὸ τῆς ζωῆς*—by the life. Death triumphs until the resurrection, and then, and in it, the life triumphs. As in 1 Cor. xv., '*When* this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, *then* shall come to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory,' but not till then. After such a repudiation of the wish to be unclothed—that is, disembodied—we surely cannot suppose that at the same time he expresses a wish to be unclothed in order that he may be present with the Lord. Must we not then understand him to say, While we are at home in the present mortal body we are absent from the Lord, and are therefore willing to leave this body, and with it the present life, in which we groan, being burdened, and to receive the immortal body, in which we shall be ever present with Him?

This view is confirmed by what follows: 'Wherefore we labour that, whether we are present or absent, we may be accepted of Him;' and the reason assigned being, 'For we must all be made manifest before the judgment-seat of Christ, that each one may receive the things done in the body, whether it be good or bad.' This will only be on the resurrection. This view is further strengthened by 1 Thess. iv., where the Apostle more fully instructs us that on the descent of our Lord, at His second coming, both the dead and living saints shall be caught away together, as one body, to meet the Lord in the air, 'and so shall we ever be with the Lord;' ever with Him in our immortal and incorruptible bodies.

Phil. i. 23 must be dealt with in strict accordance with this. It is the same desire that is expressed in both passages. The Apostle here writes, 'having the desire to depart and be with Christ, which is far better.' The word for 'depart' is unusual—*ἀναλῦσαι*—which implies loosing and returning, as of a ship loosed from her moorings to go on her voyage and return to her berth. This force is in *ἀνά*, answering to the Latin *retro*. The word is found in Luke xii. 36, *πότε ἀναλύσει*, 'when he will return from the wedding.' Now, St. Paul's statement is 'having the desire *εἰς τὸ ἀναλῦσαι καὶ σὺν Χριστῷ εἶναι*.' This I can translate only, 'for the return of, and the being with Christ,' that is, the return of Christ, and our being with Him, in accordance with 1 Thess. iv. 17. The return of the Lord from heaven, and the return of His people from the grave synchronize, each being the complement of the other.

That this was always St. Paul's hope he himself fully declares to Timothy, 2 Epistle iv. 6-8. I give the passage as in R.V.:

> For I am already being offered, and the time of my departure is come. I have fought the good fight, I have finished the course (race), I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me

the crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give to me at that day; and not only to me, but also to all them that have loved His appearing.

The Apostle is standing on the verge of the grave, having won the prize, the crown, in the Christian fight and Christian race, and is about to retire from the stadium of life—what is his hope? That he shall receive the crown on his death? No! But when the Judge shall come forth and place it on his head in that day, and on the heads of all who with the Apostle have loved His appearing. The intervening state between death and the resurrection is altogether overlooked, as if it were not.

But if these passages do not warrant the belief of the conscious existence of the souls of the righteous during the intermediate state, on what can we base the belief? We can base it on the new spiritual life—ζωὴ ἐν ἑαυτῷ—which is imparted to the soul by the new birth of the Holy Spirit. It is God's own life, eternal and immortal, and which therefore can never sleep, can never be unconscious; and we can with truth use the words of the prayer in our Burial office, 'Almighty God, with Whom do live the spirits of them that depart hence in the Lord, and with Whom the souls of the faithful, after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh, are in joy and felicity.' Yet is it a state of expectancy: they wait for their 'perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in God's eternal and everlasting glory,' when the body too shall be born in this spiritual life from the grave, and the perfected man shall, like Christ the head, live to die no more.

It is necessary to examine some passages where the word 'Hades' occurs. Our Lord's promise in Matt. xvi. 18 is, 'The gates of Hades shall not prevail against it' (the Church). *Hades*, not *Gehenna*, whose gates will never be opened, for God will 'destroy both soul and

body in Gehenna.' In Rev. i. 18, we read: 'I have the keys of Death and of Hades;' these two are connected promises of the resurrection. In Hades is the soul, and in Death is the body. The metaphor of gates and keys is employed—the keys shall unlock the gates within which, as it were, souls and bodies are respectively confined, and let them free, and then the song of triumph shall be raised, 'O Death, where is thy sting? O Hades, where is thy victory?' This implies that there was a sting, and a victory too. And there was both a sting and a victory. Sin, scorpion-like, infusing its poison into the body, did sting it to death, and Hades had its triumph over the soul. But now, in the resurrection, the poison of the sting is neutralized, and the cry rises, O Death, thy sting, it did its worst; it can do no more—I live for ever. Hades, thou hadst thy victory; now it is reversed: thy gates shall close on me no more—I triumph over thee for ever!

And again, we have these two states presented to us in Rev. xx. 13, for the last time, as first delivering up the dead—souls and bodies respectively—which were in them, and then they themselves utterly destroyed, 'cast into the lake of fire,' as being enemies to the perfect bliss of God's saints. In these three passages in the Revelation, and in vi. 8, we have Death and Hades connected. If Hades be a place while Death is a state, we have an incongruity unparalleled. But when soul and body are separated, Death is the *state* of the body, the grave its *place;* and Hades is the *state* of the soul, Heaven, in the case of the saints, its *place*. The reunion of soul and body is the destruction of both states: 'there shall be no more death.'

'He descended into Hell' now claims our attention. This Article of the present Apostles' Creed has a history of its own. The original is 'Descendit ad inferos,' most wrongly translated 'He descended into Hell' (Hades).

The correct translation is, He descended to those beneath. 'Those beneath' describes the dead in their graves. The statement is no more than 'He was buried.' I give the history in the words of the Dean of Wells in his recent work, 'The Spirits in Prison.' He writes:

> The history of the insertion of this article of the Creed presents many curious features. On the assumption that the rule of Vincent of Lerins, 'Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus,' is the measure and test of truth, it would not be difficult to construct a tolerably strong case against it. It does not appear in any of the earlier forms of the Apostles' Creed. It is not recognised in that of Nicæa, either as first drawn up in A.D. 325, or as expounded at Constantinople, or as reaffirmed at Ephesus or Chalcedon. It is wanting so far in the authority which the consent of the first four Œcumenical Councils has given to other dogmas. It was not found in the time of Ruffinus, in the creeds either of Rome or of the Churches of the East, probably only in that of Aquileia. It might even seem at first to be tainted with an heretical origin, having made its first appearance as part of any dogmatic formula in the creed which was put forward by the Arian party at the Council of Ariminum (A.D. 359.) For nearly three centuries more it was still in the background, not appearing in the creeds of the East; sometimes found, sometimes not found, in those of the West. When it next meets us it is in the Confessions of Faith which serve as transition steps towards the so called Athanasian Creed, and which was published at the fourth (A.D. 633) and seventh (A.D. 693) of the Councils of Toledo. It occurs without an explanation in the pseudo-Athanasian Creed. I have not shrunk from stating the facts of the case thus clearly, even though they may seem to make against the claims of this doctrine on our assent. They are instructive as reminding us that those claims do not rest on the decrees of councils, nor even on the most ancient formularies of Christian antiquity. Members of the Church of England might view even a much stronger case with comparative equanimity. It will be enough for them to remember that they have given their assent to this as to other articles of the faith, expressly on the ground that it may be proved by most certain warrant of Holy Writ (art. viii., pp. 75, 76).

I am not writing in reply to the Dean of Wells, so that I shall not delay to point out the very ingenious way in which he has virtually tacked the eighth of our Articles on to the third, as if the words of the former had special

reference to the descent into Hades, which is the subject of the latter, and quotes as if the Articles were one.

Bullinger also notes the late introduction of the Article into the Apostles' Creed. 'The Article,' he writes 'of the Apostles' Creed which implies an additional thought was added about A.D. 400, and is contained in no creed prior to A.D. 400, when it was used as the equivalent for the previous fact "buried."' This suggests to me another thought. At what time is it maintained that our Lord descended into the supposed abode, Hades? Was it on the moment of His death? or after His burial? If the former, then the Article is misplaced, and we should read, 'Crucified, dead, descended into hell, was buried.' But whether we read as here, or as generally in the Creed, what incongruity! Of such the Scriptures are never guilty. For three of the averments refer to Christ bodily, as do all the other averments of the Creed, and this one alone, according to the Dean, to Christ out of His body. However, according to the order of the Creed, as we have it now, Christ descended into hell after His burial. Verily those who slipped it into the Creed were blunderers.

Let me reason briefly on the historic facts here presented to us. The words '*descendit ad inferos*' were unknown to the Apostles' Creed for centuries, and therefore formed no part of the true ancient Creed of the Church. It was not until after the lapse of seven or eight centuries that they crept at all generally into the Creed of the West, and then absolutely without authority. The Dean's reason for insisting on the truth of his interpretation of the dogma is stated in the following words: 'In spite of that absence (of authority) it entered into the Creed of Christendom almost from the first'—*almost*, Mr. Dean, you admit, but not *from the first*—'and was associated with the belief that it represented the continuance in the unseen world of the redeeming work that had

been completed on the Cross.' How strange, the continuance of a work completed!

The Article does not appear in the Nicene Creed. This is the creed of the Catholic Church. Why does it not appear in that which was an expansion of the Apostles' Creed? Was the Article before the Nicene Fathers at all? Can we suppose that they were ignorant of it? This is scarcely possible. But if they were, can there be a stronger argument against its existence as Catholic truth, known to, and taught by, the Apostles? But on the supposition that they were acquainted with it, its omission from the Creed they drew up is most significant. It must have arisen from one of two reasons: either because it was untrue, or superfluous, being identical with 'He was buried,' which they retained. And this latter is confirmed by the Athanasian Creed, which omits 'He was buried,' and contains the other form of the same truth. There is tautology in the Apostles' Creed as in our present use. In the Scriptures the word 'descended' is not used in connection with Hades. Our Lord, like all other human beings, on His death descended into the grave; 'He was buried,' while His soul *went*, not *descended*, into the unseen state, called Hades. It is attempted to utilize Eph. iv. 8-10. But what was the ascent decides what was the descent. He ascended from the earth to the heaven above, as He had descended from the heaven to the earth in His incarnation. 'The lower parts of the earth' mean either 'the low-lying earth,' or, if anything more, they refer to His burial in the grave, from which He did ascend to earth's surface first, and thence to heaven.' 'He led captivity captive' is interpreted to mean 'He brought with Him out of Hades a multitude of captives;' but this is to invert the plain meaning of the words, which is, not that He freed from captivity, but that He took captive, made captive, led into captivity.

It remains now to consider the narrative of the rich man and Lazarus. Is this a parable? It is not so called by St. Luke. The Lord suddenly introduces the narrative without any hint that He is about to utter a parable. Archbishop Trench remarks, 'The question about which there has been such a variety of opinion from the first, namely, whether this be a parable or a history (history real or fictitious, it matters not), does in fact wholly depend on the manner in which it is interpreted: if the ordinary interpretation be the right one, it is certainly not, in the strictest sense of the word, a parable.' He says also, 'according to that (interpretation) commonly received, it is certainly no parable, the very essence of that order of composition being that one set of persons and things is named, another is signified; they are set over against one another.' Does this narrative comply with these conditions? It is a narrative —is it real or fictitious? Surely the latter. There are two kinds of fictitious narratives: one, a narrative of possibilities: the other, of impossibilities. The former is the parable; the latter, the fable. Jotham's narrative of the trees seeking a king belongs to the latter (Judges viii. 8-15). In this category I place the narrative of the rich man and Lazarus. It is full of impossibilities. That there should in reality be a place for disembodied souls to be gathered, divided into two quarters, separated by an impassable chasm, and where, notwithstanding, the souls of the righteous and of the unrighteous can behold each other, and hold converse, recognising each other as when in life in their bodies, is an impossibility to all except the highly imaginative, and those whose eschatology is irrespective of the resurrection; and yet the resurrection is the centre and circumference of Bible eschatology. Moreover, Abraham is represented as being lord of life and death, who had the power to raise Lazarus from the dead, and to despatch him to the rich man's

house; a power that belongs to God alone. Abraham is also represented as having Lazarus in his bosom, a place totally inadequate for all the departed righteous to congregate in. For it is not the place which the Jews supposed, borrowing the idea from the pagans, and which they designated Abraham's bosom, that is here presented to us, but the actual bosom of the patriarch, for Abraham is addressed by Dives and holds a conversation with him. Then finger and tongue are spoken of, which are utterly out of place when the body with all its members is separated from the soul. Then we have the cold water. Where was it to come from? Had Abraham it? —or was it in the flames? Could it be conceived as being in such a place? Moreover, the request, 'dip the tip of his finger in water and cool my tongue.' A drop of water hanging from a finger in the midst of burning flame! Impossible! And equally impossible that any alleviation of suffering could result from such a touch, even if such were possible. Yes, it is a narrative of impossibilities! Further, Lazarus is represented as having been carried, on his death, without burial—not his soul, but himself, else his finger could not have been spoken of —into Abraham's bosom. But Abraham was dead, and the dust of his bosom was lying in the cave of Machpelah. Also, the rich man was buried, and through the grave passed into the flame—not his soul, but his whole self, for he speaks of his tongue. I can well suppose that it was the mistaken view of this fable that led the corrupters of the Creed, about the seventh century, to teach that our Lord descended through the grave into Hades, which is virtually taught by the order of the Articles as we have them now.

Our Lord spake this fable to reveal great spiritual truth. He depicts a Sadducee, one who denied a future existence and connected judgment. He is not charged with anything unbecoming his station in life. He kindly

permitted the poor Lazarus, loathsome with uncovered sores, to lie at his gate, and be fed with the broken meat from his table; but he was an unbeliever in the revelation of the Scriptures as to the future; and this unbelief entails eternal condemnation: 'between us and you (ὑμῶν,) there is a great gulf (chasm) fixed, that they which would (οἱ θέλοντες) pass from hence to you may not be able, and that none may cross from thence to us' (R.V.). He further petitions Abraham to send Lazarus to his father's house, to testify unto his five brethren, 'lest they also come into this place of torment'—testify to them that there is a future existence and future judgment, for they too were unbelievers. Abraham's answer is that the Scriptures are sufficient, 'Moses and the prophets.' 'Nay,' is the unbelieving remonstrance, 'but if one goes to them (ἀπὸ) from the dead, they will repent' (change their mind); virtually this means, not the Scriptures, but a miracle. The crushing reply is, 'If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded if one rise from (ἐκ) the dead.' These are the lessons the narrative was intended to impress: the all-sufficiency of the Scriptures as the revelation of a future existence and future judgment; and the fearful results of unbelief of that revelation. And that revelation, from first to last, connects that existence with the resurrection, which will be the consummation and full revelation of the now only partially and imperfectly revealed truth of the future life. The idea of a third place, distinct from Heaven and Gehenna, whose origin is remote in the paganism of Babylon, and was adopted by the Jews, and accommodated to their peculiar religious opinions, and was also accepted generally by Christendom, with further additions, is calculated to throw and has thrown into the background, if not actually disparaged, the resurrection, which is the great factor in the eschatology of the Bible, and with which St. Paul so connects the future life, that if

resurrection be not, there can be no future existence for us: 'What advantageth it me if the dead rise not? Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die' (1 Cor. xv. 32).

I should not pass over without notice, that in the third of the Thirty-nine Articles 'the descent into hell' is treated of as distinct from the burial. Taking into account the fact that the Homilies, which repudiate a third place, and the Articles were drawn up by the same hands, we cannot interpret Hell in the article as a third *place*, and must therefore understand it to mean the invisible *state*, into which our Lord's human soul went on His death, and so continued while it was separated from His body. The whole Article is intended to express that our Lord's death was real, similar to the deaths of all men. We cannot, I submit, construe strictly the words 'went down.' They were taken from '*descendit ad inferos*,' the descent being into the grave, though here applied to Hell, the incorrect translation of 'inferos.'

Briefly to state my positions:

1. The souls of all men are, on death, in Hades, the invisible *state*, not *place*.

2. The souls of the righteous dead, while in this state, are in 'the Paradise,' that is, Heaven, where Christ is, and are there waiting their resurrection for the consummation of their salvation, when they shall appear with Him in glory.

3. The Scriptures are silent as to the souls of the unrighteous dead, whether during this state they are conscious or unconscious.

4. There will be a resurrection of the dead, both of the righteous and the unrighteous, when all shall be made manifest before the judgment-seat of Christ, to receive the things done in the body.

5. The two states, Death and Hades, shall, on the reunion of soul and body in the resurrection, cease to be; there shall be no more death.

6. The words 'He descended into Hell' originally imported only our Lord's burial, and were blunderingly slipped into the Apostles' Creed about the seventh century, without any authority—the words 'ad inferos' being in the Creed, as we have it, improperly translated 'into hell.'

7. As in the Creed at present they are tautological.

I cannot more suitably conclude than with the prayer in our Burial Service, already partially quoted, 'that it may please Thee, of Thy gracious goodness, shortly to accomplish the number of Thine elect, and to hasten Thy kingdom; that we, with all those that are departed in the true faith of Thy holy Name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in Thy eternal and everlasting glory, through Jesus Christ our Lord.'

'THE SPIRITS IN PRISON'—WHO WERE THEY?

'He went and preached unto the spirits in prison.'
1 Pet. iii. 18–20.

'This difficult,' sometimes 'most difficult,' passage—such are the terms we find constantly applied to this statement of St. Peter. 'Mysterious' is often added, and with justice, for mysteriousness ever marks imperfect revelation. And the revelation here is scant to a considerable degree, and the mystery is in proportion to the imperfection. But mysteriousness and difficulty, though frequently confounded, are far from being identical, or even necessarily connected. So far as any revelation goes, there ought to be no difficulty of understanding and interpretation. In this case the mystery is great. We are not informed how our Lord went, where the prison is, how many the spirits, what the subject of the proclamation, how it was received, what its final effect as regards those spirits. We are told the nature and time of their sin—even disobedience in the days of Noah, implying some special act of disobedience; but not what was the nature of the imprisonment, and many other matters connected with it. Yes, the mystery is great, but where, within the limits of the narrative, the difficulty? Our Lord went to a *certain* prison where *certain* spirits were confined for a *certain* disobedience in the days of Noah, and He made a *certain* proclamation to them. There is no word here needing a

dictionary to explain it, no involved grammatical sentence that an unlearned man could not unravel. There is a question of exegesis—whether 'He' is to be understood of the Christ in His entirety, or of His disembodied soul only; whether His visit to the prison took place on the Saturday after His crucifixion, or subsequently to His resurrection. There is a controversy on this point, but it affords no difficulty as to the visit or its object. Whether He went before or after His resurrection it matters not, it is all the same. Is there, then, no difficulty of interpretation? There is; not in the narrative itself, but in the minds of interpreters. It is difficult to fill with other matter a vessel already full. And the minds of exegetes are filled full to overflowing with an assumption—a very big assumption—which they bring to the interpretation, thus creating for themselves a difficulty they never get over. They assume, even from the first, that the spirits of the passage are the disembodied souls of disobedient men. This leads to other assumptions—viz., that the prison is identical with an unseen abode, where the souls of all sinful men are said to be confined, which, according to some, is in the centre of the earth. For this fancy we are indebted to paganism, mainly to Virgil's novel of the 'Æneid.' Then follows the assumption that no special sinners are contemplated, but that all sinners are alike comprehended; and an amount of ingenious reasoning is had recourse to in explanation of this. Then comes the assumption that the proclamation was the preaching of the gospel of salvation to those who either had not heard it when they were on earth, or who, having heard, had rejected it, and that thus another opportunity, or chance, was given them of being ultimately saved; and, the final assumption, that all the souls to whom this proclamation of the gospel was made did accept it. I do not know that anything is said in this theory about those who in after years, up to the end of time, should be

sent—that is, according to the theory—to that prison-house.

Now, here is a catena of assumptions (and I doubt if I have exhausted the list), every one of which requires to be established by clear and full revelation of Scripture. I need scarcely say no such demonstration has ever been even attempted, nor can be, as there is no reference to this transaction in any other part of Holy Scripture. As to what I have designated 'the big assumption,' and on which all the others are suspended, as the links of a chain —namely, that the *πνεύματα* are the disembodied souls (*ψυχαὶ*) of men—there is not the semblance of proof. *Πνεύματα*, standing alone, is not, so far as I know, ever predicated of the *ψυχαὶ* of men, whether righteous or unrighteous. In Heb. xii. 23 it does refer to men, righteous men, but with an addition that fixes its application, *πνεύμασι δικαίων τετελειωμένων*, 'the spirits of perfected just men'—that is, perfected at the resurrection, for while the body is in the grasp of 'him who has the power of death,' the righteous are not perfected. 'Spirits' standing alone, as it does in this passage of Peter, cannot be identified with disembodied *souls* of men, much less with disembodied souls of wicked men.

In various disquisitions on the passage I see introduced 1 Thess. v. 23, with some indistinct idea that it may possibly afford, in some misty way, a basis for the identification of *πνεῦμα* and *ψυχή*. 'your spirit and soul and body,' almost invariably quoted, even in print with inverted commas, 'body, soul, and spirit' (what has led to the inversion I cannot possibly conceive). Here, we are informed, is the tripartite nature of man. What does this mean? Is it that man is composed of three distinct parts or entities that can exist each separately from the others? We know that soul and body can be separated, and exist each in a different state and place from the other. But what of the spirit as a distinct

entity? If the spirit and the soul are only one part, what, then, becomes of the tripartite nature? And if they are not one, how can the spirit rationally be asserted to be the soul, whether in the body or out of the body? This text affords no justification for the identification sought to be established, or rather assumed, offhand. Besides, Paul is addressing Christians; and it is to them he says, 'your spirit and soul and body.' Man as man is soul and body. Again and again is he so described in Scripture. Our Lord says, 'Fear him Who is able to destroy both soul and body in Gehenna.' The Athanasian Creed so speaks of man, 'As the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ.' And, in the administration of the Lord's Supper, the words of delivery, 'preserve thy body and soul into everlasting life.' This is man. Our Lord so regards him in His conversation with Nicodemus, 'that which is born of the flesh is flesh'—it is no more—it is not spirit; and He adds, 'that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.' This is the new birth of spiritual life in the soul, and this it is which truly constitutes the Christian; the new creation, which imparts to man a new endowment, a life not possessed before by him, 'the Divine nature.' Consequent on this, it can be said to the Christian, 'your spirit and soul and body.' Nor is this spirit an entity distinct from the soul and body—it is born in them; it is life, spiritual life, which is born in the soul of the believer while he is here on earth, and in which his body shall share in the morning of the resurrection, when it shall be born from the grave, and all the redeemed shall be ἐκκλησία πρωτοτόκων—'the Church of the firstborn.'

The 'spirits' of our passage, I repeat, are not the disembodied souls of wicked men. No proof whatever of the identity is even attempted to be advanced, and none whatever is possible.

Who, then, are they? St. Peter in his second Epistle speaks of spirits in prison who had sinned, and for their sin were cast down to Tartarus, in chains, reserved unto judgment. Can we conceive a man of accurate thought, to say nothing of inspiration, in two places of his writings referring to spirits in prison because of sin, having two distinct sets of spirits in view, without any intimation to this effect? Nay, more, that in one of the references he does not allude to the spirits at all, but to totally different entities, even to the disembodied souls of men? By me such a proceeding is inconceivable. However, have we any note by which we can identify as one the imprisoned spirits of both passages? We have—the time when the sin was committed. It is specified in each passage—the days of Noah, and in connection with the ruin of the old world. In 1 Epistle iii. 18, this is sufficiently plain at first sight: 'The spirits in prison, which aforetime were disobedient, when the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a-preparing.' In 2 Epistle ii. 4, 5, we have: 'If God spared not angels when they sinned, but cast them down to Tartarus, and committed them to chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment; and spared not the old world, but preserved Noah . . . when he brought a flood upon the world of the ungodly.' Here the angels and the old world are joined in the sin which brought the judgment of the flood on the world. I am aware that this connection is not recognised by some exegetes. In Ellicott's 'Commentary' the Rev. Alfred Plummer says of the entire passage, 'The sentence has no proper conclusion. The third instance of God's vengeance is so prolonged by the addition respecting Lot, that the apodosis is wanting, the writer in his eagerness having lost the thread of the construction. The three instances here are in chronological order (wanton angels, flood, Sodom and Gomorrah).' This is a strange statement, the result

of preconceived opinions. How can we understand one writing under the influence of inspiration leaving a sentence without a conclusion? And, moreover, being so carried away by his eagerness as to lose the thread of the construction? And stranger still, if possible, that a prolonged addition to the end of the argument caused St. Peter to lose the thread of the construction at the beginning! Dr. Plummer says, 'There is no apodosis,' that is, to the first instance mentioned—the sin and judgment of the angels. He would have had St. Peter write something like this, 'If God spared not the angels that sinned, casting them down to Tartarus, but spared the angels that sinned not.' A sentence more out of gear with the Apostle's writing there could not be. In the instances of Noah and Lot the places where the sins were committed are important considerations. The flood was poured upon the world, bringing ruin upon it and the inhabitants, Noah, who lived in that world, having been first removed, and thus preserved. The fire descended from heaven upon the cities of the plain, and consumed them and their inhabitants, Lot, who lived in Sodom, having been first delivered out of it. And if, according to the criticism I am combating, the first part of the sentence is incomplete, the full sentence should be, 'if God spared not the heaven where the angels that sinned dwelt, but sent a judgment—water, or fire, or other suitable agent of destruction—upon it, but delivered the unsinning angels who dwelt therein out of it.' Now, the sin of the 'wanton' angels was not committed in the place of their habitation. We are informed by St. Jude that 'the angels kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation.' They came down to earth, and by so doing were 'disobedient,' and here on earth were guilty of their great transgression; they sinned, as afterwards Sodom and Gomorrah sinned, 'Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them, in like manner to these (the

angels) giving themselves over to fornication and going after other flesh.' The earth then being the place of the angels' transgression, St. Peter connects them with the world in the sin that brought upon it the judgment of the flood, and writes, 'If God spared not the angels and the world, but saved Noah.'

We must now look to the record of the flood to see if it affords us any clue to these statements of SS. Peter and Jude. In Gen. vi. we read that 'Men began to multiply on the earth, and daughters were born unto them,' and that 'the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose.' A full exposition of this passage is not necessary for my present purpose. For this I refer to a statement of the literature of the subject in the Rev. John Fleming's work, 'The Fallen Angels and Heroes of Mythology,' published by Hodges, Foster, and Figgis, Dublin, 1879. I shall only state my own views. 'The sons of God' is a designation of the angels. In some copies of the LXX. the words occur, 'the angels of God.' The contrast is between God and Adam, God's sons and Adam's daughters. Men multiplied and, of course, daughters were born unto them. It is said that the male descendants of Seth—'numbers of pious sons were born unto Seth'—are here intended by the sons of God, of which pious men the revelation says nothing. 'The daughters of men' are said to be 'the daughters of Cain, beautiful women,' of whom also Scripture is silent. It is said that the intermarriages took place between these, the result being a race of men of violence, owing to whom the world was destroyed. There is much that is fanciful in this theory. First, were the daughters of Seth (or perhaps he had none) so repulsive that the pious sons could not choose wives from among them? And was all the beauty to be found among the daughters of Cain, so that the pious sons were attracted to marry such sinners,

although we are not told that Cain's daughters were sinners more than Seth's? But we imagine it. I cannot, however, imagine how Seth's descendants, if they were so eminently pious, could have selected wives from pre-eminently impious women. The fact is, the Scriptures make no distinction between the descendants of Seth and of Cain; nor do they divide the inhabitants of the world into Sethites and Cainites. Adam had other sons and other daughters, and their descendants, too, are comprised in the generic term men—'Men began to multiply;' and these men, Seth, Cain, and the others, had daughters, fair women, born unto them. Angels saw these fair women, forfeited their original standing, left their proper home, came to earth, married these women, and became the fathers of a mingled race, who filled the earth with violence.

Let me digress for a moment to say something about the 'fair women,' most unwarrantably asserted to be daughters exclusively in the line of Cain. Adam and Eve, like all the other works of God's creation, were in His judgment 'very good,' perfect of their kind, the source of the human race; hence, every endowment of mind and body that that race was ever to possess must have been bestowed on them. 'The stream cannot rise higher than its source.' Accordingly, every endowment must have been theirs in perfection from the first—hearing, seeing, speaking, knowing, personal beauty, fulness of strength, the use of their members, their faculties all unimpaired. Adam stood the perfection of manly beauty; Eve, of feminine loveliness. And all their descendants for a long time must have inherited their personal beauty, until by a long course of sin the body became degraded, and physical infirmity impaired its faculties. Are we not taught this in the Gospels? Our Lord, the Creator, did acts of creation when He gave sight to the born blind, hearing and speech to the born

deaf and dumb, strength of limbs to the lame from birth, and new limbs to the maimed. And the judgment of all observers was, 'He hath done all things well;' the judgment at creation over again, 'God saw everything that He had made, and behold it was very good.' The new faculties were as perfect in their exercise as if they had been educated from infancy—the blind saw, the deaf heard, the dumb spake, the lame leaped and walked. His works of creation were perfect. Now, the daughters of men were all fair women, whether in the line of Cain, or of Seth, or of the other sons of Adam and Eve whose names are not recorded. And this is plainly asserted in the narrative; the language will bear no other construction, 'The sons of God saw the daughters of men, that they were fair.' To confine this fairness to the daughters of one line is manifestly to go beyond the Word, and, I will say, to do violence to common intelligence. Nothing more fanciful was every attempted in the way of exegesis.

But to return. These angels—sprits—who were thus disobedient, were imprisoned in Tartarus, whose locality we know not; and to these disobedient spirits, in prison in our Lord's days and still in prison, the Lord went and made a proclamation. There is a question as to the time when He did so. St. Peter's words are: *θανατωθεὶς μὲν σαρκί, ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ πνεύματι.* To me these words convey the idea that our Lord died as flesh dies, and was raised as flesh will be raised in the resurrection. The 'quickened in spirit' is the reversal of the 'putting to death in flesh.' The resurrection of our Lord was in the power of spiritual life, as will also be the resurrection of His people; 'flesh and bones,' to use His own words, but vivified with the life of the Spirit; man, but in spiritual life. In this state—raised from the dead in this spiritual life—he went and proclaimed a something to the spirits in Tartarus. To say that He preached the gospel of

salvation to the disembodied souls of special antediluvian sinners is mere assumption. It is felt to be so, and hence great effort is made on the part of some to prove that all the sinners who had died before our Lord's visit were objects of His preaching, to give them a chance of being saved. To do this is to be wise above what is written, for the record limits the sinners to those who were disobedient in the days of Noah. I may add that I see no revelation that our Lord, while His soul was in the disembodied state, did anything. He rested. He was not while in that state (nor are we) perfect as man; while soul and body are separated man is virtually, if I may use the expression, in abeyance. He awaits the resurrection. It would have been a strange thing for Him to preach Himself the Saviour of sinners while he was actually enduring the penalty of their sin. It is the risen, living Christ, and not the dead Christ, that is the Saviour. Salvation was not an accomplished fact until Jesus Himself was saved 'out of death,' and therefore could not have been proclaimed before. His heel was still bruised. He could not possibly have proclaimed Himself victor while His cry was, 'Save me, O God, for the waters are come in unto My soul' (Ps. lxix. i.); 'Out of the belly of Sheol cried I' (Jonah ii. 2).

Besides, both body and soul are alike the subject of salvation; that is, the man is saved—not merely a part of him. So the scriptures speak; so the services of the Church. For instance, in the Communion office, as already referred to, the solemn words of delivery recognise this: 'The body—the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ—preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life.' And the judgment hereafter will be, not for anything done in the separate state, but, as Paul declares to the Corinthians, 'We must all appear—be made manifest—before the judgment-seat of Christ, that each one may receive the things done in (or through) the body, accord-

ing to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad' (2 Cor. v. 10). *There is a dead silence in Scripture as to any judgment for deeds done out of the body*, if such there can be. I say, if such there can be. Is this revealed to us, that a man in his entirety can be, and shall be, responsible for what a part of him may do? I know not where anything approaching to this is spoken of in the Scriptures. The resurrection is the great factor in any doctrine of eschatology we can gather from them. 'If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable; but now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the firstfruits of them that slept.' And again, 'What advantageth it me, if the dead rise not? Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die' (1 Cor. xv. 19, 32). Around the resurrection circle all the utterances of the Scriptures regarding the future life; and the whole man's future will be decided according to what the whole man's life was here on earth.

But are we to regard the fall of the angels merely as an episode, an incidental event, having no vital connection with the history of the world, and with God's purpose concerning it? When we look more closely, we shall see the important place it occupies in the warfare between God and Satan which still progresses on the earth. A few intimations in the Scriptures reveal to us a great deal. Thus our Lord, when He charged the Jews with the design to kill Him, said, 'Ye do the deeds of your father . . . Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will (to) do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not—stood not—in the truth' (John viii. 41-44). Here are two important statements, viz.: (1) Satan was a murderer from the beginning; (2) he abode not in the truth.

Satan was *ἀνθρωποκτόνος*. How are we to understand this? To refer it to the murder of Abel is manifestly not correct. Hence some have referred it to the fall of

man—the human race was murdered by Satan when he caused the fall, which brought death into the world. The true meaning is, undoubtedly, the murderer of man, the race. But what of the words, 'from the beginning'? And what of the connection so plainly asserted between the two statements, 'He was a murderer,' and 'He stood not in the truth'? They lift the veil from the eternity *a parte ante*, and reveal a something that took place before the foundations of the world were laid. St. Paul speaks of 'the eternal purpose of God which He purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord' (Eph. iii. 11). That purpose was God incarnate, God in Christ, the Christ. This purpose could only be eternal as in His own eternal Being. With God there is no afterthought. Our Lord declares Himself to be 'the truth.' Thus 'the truth' is identical with 'the eternal purpose.' In this truth, this purpose, Christ, God and man, Satan stood not. Must then God not have made known to the heavenly hosts His purpose—to create a new nature, man; to take that nature into union with Himself—one with Him—that in this nature would be the grand manifestation of Himself, Christ exalted above the hierarchy of heaven, to receive the homage of all created things as their Head? Even as afterwards it was said in the Book of Psalms, 'Worship Him, all ye gods' (xcvii. 7), quoted by St. Paul in Heb. i. 6, 'When He again bringeth in the first-begotten into the world, He saith, Let all the angels of God worship Him.' Against this Satan, 'lifted up with pride,' rebelled; he must have been the highest archangel of heaven; next, though at an immeasurable distance beneath, to God Himself; a being of such power that only in the name of Jehovah could Michael the archangel successfully resist him (Jude 9). Then and there Satan determined to ruin the human race, whenever it should be created. This is 'the beginning' from which he became the murderer of man.

At the time fixed in God's counsel the earth arose as the theatre of the manifestation of the Christ. Man was created in the image of God, the image in which He designed to appear in fulfilment of His purpose. To Adam He gave delegated authority over all the works of His hands. Adam thus wearing in his person the similitude of God, and ruling over the earth, was 'the type of the coming One' (Rom. v. 14). This was the inchoate fulfilment of the promised revelation. So that when the inhabitants of the heavens, who were waiting in longing expectation of the event, saw this beginning of its accomplishment, 'The morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy' (Job xxxiii. 7). But Satan watched with fiendish determination to defeat the counsel of the Most High, and, as his first step, accomplished the fall. How could God ever take a nature stained with disobedience, polluted with sin, into union with Himself, and elevate it to be the head of the unfallen ones? This, we may conceive, was the reasoning of his heart; and he must have rejoiced at the success of his temptation. His triumphing was short. The promise of the woman's seed, as the Redeemer of man, and the destroyer of himself, led him to devise some other scheme for the ruin of the race.

His great effort was the corruption of the human nature by the mixture of angelic with it, so that there could be no pure seed of the woman to bruise his head. Hence the narrative in Genesis vi. But God's purpose could not be defeated. There was one man still on earth, righteous as to character, walking with God, a man of faith in Him. As to his nature, a pure man, 'perfect in his generations,' no admixture of the angelic in him or his children. God determined to sweep the mixed race from the face of the earth, and to constitute the pure man, Noah, the second head of the race. Hence the flood. The angels imprisoned in Tartarus could not

again offend. In due time the woman's seed was born, and on His birth we read of the attempt of Herod to destroy the young child. Another effort of Satan defeated. Then next we have the Temptation, during which Satan tried hard to get his superiority acknowledged: 'Fall down and worship me, and all shall be Thine. Only receive the kingdom from me, and I give up all.' Again defeated in his desperate efforts against the Christ and His supremacy, he left Him alone until he compassed His crucifixion. Has he triumphed? The resurrection is the answer. The man Who hung upon the accursed cross rose from the dead, and, man in all the essentials of humanity, ascended into the heavens, and is now seated on the throne of glory, the woman's seed, waiting until the day fixed in the Father's counsels, when the Son of Man shall return, and triumph finally and for ever over Satan and his angels.

Taking all this into account, is it too fanciful to suppose that the subject of our Lord's proclamation to the spirits in prison, when He appeared to them in His resurrection humanity, had in it something consonant to their peculiar sin, and His triumph over their effort to ruin the human race?

One more thought. It is a deep subject—the origin of evil. Do we not see it here? What is evil? Decide this, and its origin is not far to seek. Evil is opposition to the Christ. It first broke out in heaven. The first manifestation of it on earth was in Eden. In the words, 'he stood not in the truth,' we have the origin of evil, and the evil itself, from which has flowed all the moral and physical evil which has, alas! abounded on earth from the fall to the present, and will abound until He comes to put an end to it for ever. And is it from this our Lord has taught us to pray, 'Deliver us from the evil;' and from which He prayed His Father to keep His disciples, 'I pray not that Thou shouldst take them

out of the world, but that Thou shouldst keep them from the evil'? And is this the evil in which St. John tells us 'the whole world is lying'?

To recapitulate in substance what I have here advanced: the great fact of the creation is the Christ; the great fact of the redemption is the Christ; and the redemption is the destruction of the works of the devil, by the deliverance of the creation from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God, in order that God's purpose, apparently marred for a time by the evil, may be accomplished, even 'the eternal purpose which He purposed in Christ Jesus,' by Whom, and in Whom, and for Whom 'were all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth,' and to Whom shall be the dominion for ever.

UNIVERSALISM.

A REPLY.

THE writer to whom I reply, in the opening of his paper lays down very proper rules and principles to guide us in considering religious questions.

1. The Word of God is the only authority; not the deductions of our reason.
2. Man does not possess a 'verifying faculty,' which may be put in opposition to the statements of Scripture.
3. The only question for us is, What saith the Scripture?

Forgetting, however, these rules and principles, the writer, in the absence of Scripture statements to support his propositions, rests upon the deductions of reason, which is regarded as an unerring authority. Thus we read, 'whether more consistent with our ideas of a perfect Almighty God.' '*Our* ideas' being evidently, in this passage, made the infallible standard by which to judge God's conduct. What if our ideas of God be incorrect? At best they are imperfect.

In considering the paper, I shall first deal with its *commissions*, then with its *omissions*.

The argument by which the author endeavours to establish his views of the limited duration of the future punishment of the finally impenitent is one of probability.

It is this, the word *αἰώνιος*, though sometimes importing endless duration, is generally used to express a limited period. The word *πάντα*, though sometimes not importing universality, yet generally does; therefore, when we take these two words into our consideration in their bearing, respectively, on redemption and future punishment, we conclude that future punishment *may be* of limited duration. The argument, as stated in the paper, does not go beyond this, but yet it is so put as to induce the readers to draw the full conclusion that, therefore, future punishment shall be limited.

Do the premises justly lead to this conclusion? If *αἰώνιος* sometimes means 'everlasting,' and if *τὰ πάντα* sometimes has a limited application, may not the punishment be everlasting? There is no logical necessity why it should be limited. My present position is, not that the premises are correct, and the conclusion a *non-sequitur*, but that, admitting the premises to be correct, the conclusion drawn from them is not logical.

I shall now follow the paper in the order in which the points of the argument are presented to us. We read at the opening that in the Bible 'there are two classes of passages,' of which, 'one seems to teach universal redemption, the complete overthrow of the work of the devil, the restitution of all things.' And 'the other seems to teach the eternal perdition of those who in this life reject the Salvation of Christ, and remain impenitent.' Examples of both classes are given, and we are informed that either the word 'all' in one class cannot mean *all*, or that 'eternal' in the other cannot mean 'without end.' This startling proposition is attempted to be established thus, 'If all things are to be reconciled to God, no sinners can remain for ever unreconciled; if the punishment of the impenitent is never-ending, can all things be reconciled?'

The fallacy underlying this reasoning is, that every

enemy, angelic and human, is included in the 'all' of the passage. This is the point to be proved, not quietly assumed. This fallacy meets us in another form further on in the paper where it is more apparent.

'The genesis' of *αἰώνιος* next occupies our attention. We are told it 'is the adjective derived from *αἰών* (Latin *ævum*), an age; and primarily means simply for an age, or more strictly for *the* age. From this origin it became a general term for expressing lengthened indefinite duration.' Is this correct? Is *αἰών* a root, and the root of *αἰώνιος*? It is derived from *ἀεὶ*, *semper* (always) and *ὤν*, *existens* (existing). From this root spring both *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος*. Hence the primary import of the words is everlasting, 'always existing.' It is, then, primarily, applicable only to God, and His duration, or age. He is *ἀεὶ ὤν*, *αἰώνιος* and His duration *ἀεὶ ὤν*, *αἰών*. From thus expressing the age (or duration) of God, in the natural tendency, and perhaps through the poverty of language, the noun came to express lengthened duration, the entire period of a long age, and the adjective to mean simply 'for the age,' that is, the age of which it is predicated. That the word sometimes at least means 'never-ending' is admitted. The paper says 'there is nothing to force us to the conclusion that the word must *always* mean 'never-ending.' I have shown that primarily this is its meaning, and *ex necessitate rerum*, it must be, when applied to the age whose duration is unaffected by the changes of earth, and is in itself eternal.

Time is sometimes represented as a parenthesis of eternity, but not accurately. If we represent eternity by a line without beginning or end, time will be a line, a short one too, let down at both its ends from the other, and running parallel with it, coming as it were out of it, and being absorbed into it again. The ages of time, whether as respects the earth, or the Church, began with the creation of the earth, and will terminate when life's

drama closes with the great assize. Then the only age existing, or to exist, will be that which had no beginning, which progressed while side by side with it Time's short day ran out to its close, and which shall never know an end.

The use of *αἰώνιος* in the New Testament is thus described in the paper. 'In the New Testament we find it employed once with reference to God the Father (Rom. xvi. 26, "The everlasting God"); once with reference to the Holy Spirit (Heb. ix. 14, "The eternal Spirit"). In every other place where the word occurs, it is used either with reference to the future state of blessedness or misery.' From the fact that we have two undoubted applications of the word as 'everlasting,' one would conclude naturally, easily, and justly, that in the other passages the word must have the same meaning. But not so our author; his conclusion is as follows, 'we cannot therefore from these latter passages at present draw any conclusion.' Why? I ask. Are they too few? How could twenty additional passages, with the same undoubted import of 'everlasting duration,' compel assent, if two are not sufficient? If the number were two hundred and two, we should be referred to the LXX., in which, we are told, 'the word *αἰώνιος* is used almost invariably' (an admission, this, that it sometimes has its proper force even in that book) 'in its strict and literal sense' (which I have shown is not its strict and literal sense) 'as enduring for *the* age, or dispensation then existing.' I shall be satisfied here with simply entering my protest against this style of argument. I have already demonstrated its radical unsoundness.

I must, however, refer to a small attempt to weaken the force of *αἰώνιος* as predicated of God. The writer says 'the word seems employed to express eternity without beginning, more than, though not excluding, eternity without end.' Why? Eternity *a parte ante* must also be

eternity *a parte post;* the converse is not true, that which has a beginning may not, necessarily, have an end; but that which had no beginning must have no end. If, then, *αἰώνιος* denotes eternity *a parte ante*, it must include eternity *a parte post*, and 'the everlasting God' of Rom. xvi. must be the God who had no beginning, and will have no end.

The word *πᾶς* next comes under review. It is admitted that the word sometimes 'seems used for a great many, not strictly meaning all.' This rule, however, does not affect the words *τὰ πάντα.* 'We do not find,' is the writer's remark, 'the expression, *τὰ πάντα*, I believe, used in this sense, and certainly we do not find the word used *systematically* for a smaller number than the whole.' The word 'systematically' in this quotation qualifies the former assertion, to some extent, and is an admission that sometimes *τὰ πάντα* does, or at least may, indicate less than the whole. I do not say it ever does, but the admission nullifies altogether the argument founded on one invariable use of the words.

But do the words *πάντες* and *πάντα* ever mean 'less than the whole'? How can they? The mistake arises from confounding the meaning of the words with their particular application. In their import they embrace the whole, in their application only the subject under consideration. For example, our subject is the earth: we are speaking of all living beings: of course our reference is limited to the earth, and the living beings in heaven and hell are excluded. We speak of a nation, a city, family, society—the word *all*, when used in connection with any of these, contemplates all of that nation, city, family or society, but of that alone. That is, the word is universal in its meaning, but particular in its application. Thus, in Acts x. 33, Cornelius says to Peter: 'Now, therefore, are *we all* here present before God, to hear *all things* that are commanded thee of God.' 'All' in both cases

means *all*; it is universal in its import, but the first 'all' is confined in its application to the friends called together by Cornelius; and the second, to the things commanded of God.

Another passage will help us in our consideration of texts mainly relied on by our author to prove one of his positions. In 1 Cor. xv. 27 we read, 'He hath put all things (*πάντα*) under His feet.' We have then the declaration of common-sense, 'it is manifest that He is excepted Who did put all things (*τὰ πάντα*) under Him.' This passage is remarkable, as referring to the *τὰ πάντα* which in the future are to be reconciled unto God, pointing out clearly, as it does, the limited application of the words, that they have exceptions, as we might say.

Two passages are advanced in the paper to establish the writer's opinion; viz., Eph. i. 10 and Col. i. 20. It is evident that in these there are exceptions; that is, that *τὰ πάντα*, universal in meaning, is limited in application; He who reconciles, and He by whom the reconciliation is effected being both excepted. Are there no other exceptions implied in the passages? In both the expression is limited in its application to 'the things in heaven, and the things on earth.' *The things in hell are not included.* It will be seen as we proceed that this remark is of immense importance; I beg, therefore, that it may be borne in mind.

To another quotation I must call attention, Rev. xxi. 5, 7: 'I make all things new,' and 'he that overcometh shall inherit all things.' The lake of fire is specified in the succeeding verse as the portion of the finally impenitent. Surely it is excluded from the 'all things made new,' and inherited by the redeemed; 'on such the second death hath no power.'

While admitting that *αἰώνιος may* have an unlimited, and *τὰ πάντα* a limited, application, yet assuming that he has unanswerably proved his two positions, viz., that

αἰώνιος *must* be understood in a limited, and τὰ πάντα in a universal, sense, our writer proceeds to argue that such *must be* their meaning when predicated, respectively, of future punishment and redemption. This is the argument—all being redeemed, fallen angels, devils, and men, every one of them, earth and hell itself too; and the punishment of angels, devils and men, though of great severity and of long duration, being only αἰώνιος, must, taking into account both considerations, come sometime to an end.

In this argument, Universalism is boldly advanced, and attempted to be proved by the following propositions:

1. Of those to whom the Gospel is preached since Christ came, but few savingly believe it.
2. Christ died to save the world.
3. Christ was sent to destroy the works of the devil.

In connection with these is argumentation to establish their strength. As to the first, there is a limitation of the objects of the Gospel to men, 'since the coming of the Lord.' But few of these believe truly, 'say one thousandth.' We are asked, 'can we apply to that number the term *all*?' It is assumed here that our Lord came with the fixed will and intention to save all, subjectively; that is, to save every man, woman, and child. Now, this is a very incorrect view of the end of our Lord's advent, and is in fact a *petitio principii*, in which the whole matter to be established is quietly assumed. Why the people who lived before the Lord's coming, and why the millions who never hear the Gospel, or who have not heard it, are excluded from the statement is not easily surmised, unless it have a bearing on a subsequent assertion.

As to the second—'Christ died to save the world'—passages are quoted in which the word 'world' occurs, *e.g.*, 'the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world.' It is assumed that 'world,' like 'all,' has the subjective meaning of every man, woman, and child.

To establish the human reference of the word, 1 John v. 19 is adduced: 'We are of God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness.' This verse of all others proves the opposite, for a contrast is drawn between the 'we' who are believers, and 'the whole world,' which cannot, therefore, include the believers; these are delivered from it, and are not of it. 'The whole world' has exceptions, and so has 'all.' Without any force, then, is the question, 'If God's purpose was to save the world by Christ, has His purpose failed?'

As to the third—'Christ was sent to destroy the works of the devil.' It is said, 'Christ's mission, we learn, was to "destroy the works of the devil."' It is asked, 'Would it be to destroy his works, if it left him for ever with the far greater portion of the human race as his prisoners?' It is not broadly asserted, but I suspect our author entertains the idea, that we cannot undo the mischief anyone has done, unless we either undo himself, or make him repent of his deeds, and bestow favours upon him. I am trying in this reply to destroy the work of the writer of the original paper—is it the case that I shall not succeed unless I also destroy himself, or disabuse his mind of its errors, bestowing favours upon him? Is it the case that Satan's work cannot be destroyed unless Satan's own sin be forgiven, and he himself be reconciled to God and restored to his original righteousness and principality?

Where did our author obtain the idea that the lost are to be 'Satan's prisoners,' and that he is 'left for ever to triumph over the greater number of Adam's descendants'? An angelic Pluto, dwelling in some infernal palace, revelling in fiendish delight over the damned! Satan will be no gaoler, but himself a prisoner; not triumphing over, but suffering like punishment with the condemned in the 'everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels.' Where are we told that the damned will be 'the greater portion of the human race'? The paper, as I have

remarked, contemplates only those to whom, since the coming of our Lord, the Gospel is preached. Can it be supposed that these comprise 'the greater number of Adam's descendants'? To this I shall refer again.

Romans v. 18, 19, is next commented on. The not unnatural mistake is made that the Apostle here draws a contrast, in the words of the author, 'between Adam's work of evil, and Christ's work of redemption.' A contrast is drawn in verses 16, 17, but in 18, 19 there is an analogy. '*As* by the offence of one . . . *so* by the righteousness of one—*As* by one man's disobedience . . . *so* by the obedience of one.' This supposed contrast is the point of our author's argument. He says, 'Where is the force of the contrast if we regard by the first "many" all, and by the second "many" a small proportion?' In my judgment 'many' would rather imply a large proportion, 'a great multitude which no man could number'; but passing this by, I quote again, 'Does it not seem, so far as the people of the world are concerned, Satan's power would be superior to the Saviour's? and Satan's work greater than the Saviour's? and Satan left for ever to triumph over the greater number of Adam's descendants?' As there is no contrast drawn in the passage, all this reasoning falls to the ground.

Another fallacy that meets us here is that πάντας (all) and πολλοί (many) are identical in meaning, and, in fact, are used interchangeably by the Apostle. Literally translated the passage is as follows: 'As then by one offence (judgment came) upon all men—πάντας—unto condemnation, so also by one righteousness (the free gift came) upon all men—πάντας—unto justification of life. For as by the disobedience of the one man, the many—οἱ πολλοί—were made sinners, so also by the obedience of the one shall the many—οἱ πολλοί—be made righteous.' Why was the word πάντας (all) changed for πολλοί (many)? According to the paper, for no cause whatever;

yet our reason, which apprehends the difference existing between the two words, tells us there must be a cause. This can only be found in the fact that all will not be saved. The difference between the words, in respect of Redemption, may be thus stated: πάντες regards men *objectively*, πολλοί *subjectively*. In other words, 'He is the Saviour of all men (objective), specially of those that believe' (subjective). 'The Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world' (objective). But 'Whosoever believeth on Him shall not perish, but have everlasting life' (subjective). According to the hypothesis of the writer, none shall perish, but all, believers and unbelievers alike, shall have everlasting life, Christ having died that none might perish, but that all might come to repentance.

I have already objected to the standard our author sets up whereby to judge what is, or what is not, consistent with God's character, 'our ideas' of Him. Acting according to this principle, he places before us two propositions:

1. 'That there shall be for ever in His kingdom a region where sin and iniquity will abound in their grossest forms.'
2. 'That He will purge out all iniquity, and destroy all sin, and restore to the universe which He has made, perfect holiness, purity, peace and happiness.'

He asks, 'Which of these is more consistent with our ideas of a perfect Almighty, holy God?' The answer, and the only answer, is, *Whichever the Scriptures assert shall be*. No man is qualified otherwise to answer. No finite mind can comprehend the infinite perfection of God, so as to decide that this is, or that this is not, consistent with His character. We must, therefore, examine these propositions in the light of Scripture.

There are two fruitful errors at their root :

1. That the region of woe forms part of God's kingdom.
2. That in that region sin abounds in its grossest forms.

With respect to the first I have to remark, that in the explanation of the parable of the tares in the wheat (Matt. xiii. 41-43) our Lord declares, 'The Son of Man shall send forth His angels, and they shall gather out of His kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity ; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire ; there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth.' Here are two distinct places specified—the kingdom of the Son of Man, and the furnace of fire ; out of the former are gathered all things that offend and they who do iniquity, and are cast into the latter, which cannot, therefore, form any region of that kingdom.

We now turn to the glowing description of the final state of the redeemed themselves and their eternal home, given in Rev. xxi. The new heaven and the new earth, and the new Jerusalem are described, and the perfect happiness of its inhabitants: and, besides, the lake of fire, as the abode of 'the fearful and unbelieving, and the abominable and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers and idolaters, and all liars.' The lake of fire is distinct from the new heaven and new earth, coexists with them, but forms no part thereof. In chap. xxii. 14, 15, we have this even more distinctly taught : 'Blessed are they that do His commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city. For without are dogs, and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and idolaters, and whatsoever loveth and maketh a lie.' 'Without,' that is, in a region distinct from the city of the redeemed.

The error in the second proposition is, that 'sin in its grossest forms' will abound in the region of woe. We read in the Scriptures that 'there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth; that the rich man lift up his eyes, being in torment,' and begged for mercy to his brethren on earth; but in no place of reference to that region is there anything to warrant the thought that sin will abound there in its worst forms. There will be sinners there with sinful hearts, but sinners undergoing punishment, bewailing their lot, weeping because of sins committed in this life, whose very sorrow must form a main ingredient of their sufferings. Will the drunkard then carouse to his heart's content? Will the profligate then indulge his licentious propensities? Will the miser then hoard up his coveted gold? Will the idolater then commit abominations with sticks and stones? And if none of these things can be—and they cannot—what is meant by sin in its worst forms abounding? The craving thirst, the burning lust, the covetous desires may haunt, and harass, and consume (if possible), but, if so, the punishment will be, that these cravings cannot be indulged in. What a picture of Gehenna is drawn by the writer! Satan with fiendish delight incarcerating and chaining the lost as his prisoners, triumphing in his work, as he passes through the wards and along the corridors of the prison house, and yet the prisoners indulging in sins of all kinds, enjoying the pleasures thereof, for there is pleasure in Sin! How different the representations of Scripture! Satan and other fallen angels, and impenitent men together, God's prisoners, 'in outer darkness, weeping, and wailing, and gnashing their teeth!

Yes! He will purge out all iniquity, and destroy all sin, and restore to the universe holiness, and happiness, and peace. But it will be when He has gathered out of that universe all offenders and offences, and shall have cast them into the everlasting fire, distinct from that

universe (where existing we know not, but) 'prepared for the devil and his angels.'

Our author's argument is done; nothing more in favour of his proposition than what I have criticised is in his paper; his conclusion being that from the texts he has adduced, and the considerations he has advanced, the weight of evidence would lead us to the opinion of the non-eternity of future punishment, and the consequent ultimate salvation of all devils, angels, and men.

He feels, however, he should not pass over one stumbling-block in his way, one awkward text, without an effort to weaken its force, and accordingly he adds to his argument, as it were by way of postscript, a reference to Matthew xxv. 46. The argument in opposition to his views, derived from this passage, he calls 'plausible.' It is well known to be that the word *αἰώνιος* is predicated both of the punishment of the wicked and of the life of the righteous, and that whatever be its import in connection with one, must be its import in connection with the other; that if the life is eternal, so must be the punishment; if the punishment is of limited duration, so must the life be; and that the latter rules the former.

What is our author's answer? 'In opposition to this text I would place Rom. v. 18, 19.' Paul opposed to Christ! He cannot mean this. Of course, by 'opposition' he must mean juxtaposition. One text cannot oppose another. The writer argues that 'all' in both branches of this passage (Rom. v. 18, 19) must be interpreted alike, if *αἰώνιος* in Matt. xxv. 46 must bear the same meaning in each case. The relevancy of this reasoning I confess I cannot see, but I pass it by, having already examined Rom. v. 18, 19 at some length, and in such manner as will serve to point out the irrelevancy of the reasoning here. Our author, however, admits that whatever import we attach to *αἰώνιος* must apply alike to

the punishment and the life. 'But what does it mean?' he asks; and he answers 'that there will be perfect happiness for the righteous during that era or dispensation which will be ushered in by the judgment day.' As to the wicked, he says, 'there will be misery for them throughout that era.' We might consider this an admission against himself, did he not add, 'nothing is said concerning what may follow,' that is, follow the era ushered in by the judgment day. One more sentence, and my quotations are ended. 'But this does not imply that then that happiness shall come to an end'. . . . the sentence is incomplete; our author perceived whither he was rushing, and suddenly pulled up without the natural finish; nor does it imply that then the misery shall come to an end. In place of this we have 'All the rest of the Bible leads to the belief that such will not be the case, but that then all shall be reconciled to God.' A noble jump to a foregone conclusion! The 'all' in this passage includes all in 'the everlasting fire,' 'the devil and his angels' and 'cursed' men.

I have a word in reply. *The era the judgment day shall usher in will know no end;* time will be absorbed in eternity. One hint that that age, admitted to be of long continued duration, will ever close is not to be found in the Bible; and every part of its revelation concerning that age is in opposition to the idea. Therefore, admitting *αἰώνιος* to mean 'for the age,' the life and the punishment being 'for the age,' since the age will last for ever, so must both the life and the punishment. Here I quote 2 Peter iii. 18: 'To him be glory both now and *εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος*'—the day of the age, or of eternity.

My task might now be considered accomplished, were it not for some remarkable omissions in the paper on which I have been so long commenting. Far too little is said of the use of the words *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος* in the New Testament. I purpose, therefore, to specify a few passages

in which there cannot be a shadow of doubt that *never-ending duration* is implied.

Of the vast mass of texts where the word *αἰώνιος* qualifies the future life of the righteous, I select only a few, and these for reasons specified in each case. 'Eternal life': 'Everlasting life' are expressions which meet us in almost every book of the New Testament over and over again. In Mark x. 30 we have 'in the world (*αἰῶνι*) to come, eternal (*αἰώνιος*) life.' The junction here of *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος* clearly shows that *ὁ αἰὰν ὁ ἐρχομένος* is eternity.

1 John i. 2: 'eternal (*αἰώνιος*) life which was with the Father.' Can we doubt that the life of the Father is unending?

John x. 28: 'I give unto them eternal (*αἰώνιος*) life and they shall never (*οὐ μὴ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*) perish,' *αἰώνιος* and *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* both importing 'for ever.'

A remarkable application of *αἰώνιος* is found in Philemon v. 15: 'receive him for ever'—a brother for eternity.

In 2 Thess. i. 9 the word is coupled with *ὄλεθρον*, 'everlasting destruction.' Any attempt to limit *αἰώνιος* in this passage is futile; for *ὄλεθρον* necessitates the sense of unending. A thing may be bruised, battered, broken, crushed, and be restored, but its destruction is for ever; restoration there cannot be.

Let me ask in what words could unending condemnation have been expressed in the Scripture, if *αἰώνιος* does it not? We have 'eternal punishment, eternal destruction, eternal judgment'; *αἰώνιος* qualifies these nouns, the words which describe God's endless existence, glory, power; and yet we are gravely told the word cannot be understood in the same sense when predicated of His judgments, but in one that is diametrically opposite!

1 Tim. vi. 16: 'To whom be honour and power everlasting' (αἰώνιος).

I shall now take another form of the word, viz., εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, Matt, xxi. 19: 'Let no fruit grow on thee henceforward for ever' εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

Mark iii. 29: 'hath never (οὐκ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα) forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation' (αἰώνιος κρίσις). Who would venture to translate the former otherwise than 'for ever'; and when the latter is joined to it, who would limit its application?

John xi. 25, 26. In the preceding quotation we have εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα asserted of judgment; here it is coupled with life: 'he that believeth on Me, though he were dead (though he die), yet shall he live; (at the resurrection) and (then) he that liveth and believeth on Me shall never die' ('not die eternally,' P. B.) εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. As is its duration when predicated of life, must be its duration when predicated of death.

Another form—εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

Matt vi. 13: 'The power and glory for ever.'

Rom. i. 25: 'The Creator, blessed for ever.'

Heb. xiii. 8: 'Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever.'

We have still another form εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.

Gal. i. 5: 'Be glory for ever and ever.'

Rev. i. 18: 'I am alive for evermore' (for ever and ever).

Rev. iv. 9: 'Who liveth for ever and ever.'

Rev. xi. 15: 'He shall reign for ever and ever.'

Rev. xxii. 5: 'They shall reign for ever and ever.'

Can we doubt that eternal duration is in each instance here intended? Side by side with these texts I place Rev. xiv. 11: 'The smoke of their torment ascends up for ever and ever,' and Rev. xx. 10: 'Shall be tormented for ever and ever.'

I place this last quoted verse alongside Matt. xxv. 46, both referring to the same time, same place, and same

individuals, and assert that εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων is the Scriptural exposition of αἰώνιος in this passage.

As to all these texts, I assert fearlessly no language can more fully and more simply describe unending duration, and if they do not, it would be utterly impossible to express it at all.

Although I have brought forward arguments deduced from every class of passages in the Scriptures bearing upon the subject, are there not other considerations which cannot be overlooked? What, for instance, about sin's enormity? If this bears any relation to its punishment, and if this be limited, so must the guilt of sin, and sin not be 'exceeding sinful.' What of the atonement? If sin be not of infinite magnitude, and its due punishment be but of temporary duration, must not the character and intrinsic efficacy of the atonement be estimated accordingly? Would God needlessly expend strength? or require a sacrifice of infinite value to be offered for finite sin, and to save from finite punishment? An infinite payment of a finite debt! That were, indeed, for God to act contrary to all that is revealed of Him in Scripture. It is impossible for anyone to entertain Scriptural views of the atonement who holds the non-eternity of future woe.

On the hypothesis, must not our Lord have expressed Himself differently when sending forth His disciples to preach the Gospel? Should He not have said, He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved at once; and he that believeth not shall first be damned, and then be saved? Did not our Lord err when He put into Abraham's mouth, in the parable, the words 'Between us and you there is a great gulf fixed, so that they which would pass from hence to you cannot: neither can they pass to us that would come from thence,' knowing, as He must have, that there was no such impossibility, but that after a time all should pass from thence?

Moreover, both fallen angels and men must be restored, although it is clearly argued in the Hebrews that our Lord taketh not hold of angels to save them, having assumed only the nature of man.

And again, some will be saved through repentance and faith, being purified by the word: and others by punishment.

But, if none of these things can be, then the non-eternity of future punishment, and consequent salvation of devils, angels, and cursed men, cannot be maintained.

II. EPISCOPACY SCRIPTURAL.

EPISCOPACY.

My subject is not *Diocesan* Episcopacy, which was a thing of growth, though rapid, and which grew up out of the necessities of the Church: a matter within the bounds of the Church's authority, and fairly comprised within 'whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven.' The Apostolic rule, 'Let all things be done decently and in order,' surely has force in such a case. The 'Diocese' of the Church answers to the 'District,' or 'Circuit,' or 'Presbytery' of dissenting communities. If it be un-Scriptural, so are the others. Admitted that all are *non*-Scriptural things which are not prescribed in Scripture—this does not make them, or any of them, *un*-Scriptural, or what is contrary to Scripture. These two are constantly confounded by the opponents of Episcopacy, who labour hard to demolish *Diocesan* Episcopacy, as not being, in so many words, prescribed in Scripture, and conclude they have, therefore, demolished Episcopacy as being prescribed by Scripture. It must, I think, be conceded that the Episcopacy of the Church of Ireland in its earliest days was not Diocesan. A bishop was located in a certain place, with a number of priests and deacons under him, who radiated, as it

were, in all directions round, without any prescribed territorial limits, preaching the Gospel and ruling the congregations then formed by them. Whether Diocesan or non-Diocesan, the Episcopal is the Scriptural form of Church government in its essential character, while the Diocese is but accidental—it may or may not be expedient—and in this respect is a fair matter of discussion. By Episcopal government I am to be understood as meaning government by Bishops, having inferior officers under them, Priests, (*i.e.* Presbyters or Elders) and Deacons. 'It is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church—Bishops, Priests, and Deacons'—*Preface to the Ordination Services.*

Anxious to condense my subject as much as is compatible with its elucidation, and consistent with clearness of statement, I purpose to confine myself strictly within the limits of Scriptural considerations, arguments, and proofs. I shall pass by altogether the uninspired writings of the earliest ages; as, though a weight every controversialist desires to throw into his side of the scale, they cannot establish our position on the firm basis on which it ought undoubtedly to rest. I shall take no advantage of the admission every enlightened opponent makes, that very early in the Christian era, the Episcopal form of Church government had been generally, if not universally, adopted by the Churches—an admission this, it will be seen, fatal to our opponents—for, if sanctioned by St. John, the longest lived of the Apostles, Episcopacy is Apostolic; it forms part of 'the Apostle's teaching and fellowship,' in which it behoves all Christians, as recorded of the first converts, steadfastly to continue (Acts ii. 42).

It is necessary here to submit a statement of the doctrine. It is simply and briefly this: there is imparity (or inequality) in the Christian ministry; in other words,

there are different orders of ministers. In the imparity there are three ranks, or degrees, the lower being subordinate to the higher. These orders, at the present day, are designated *Bishops*, *Priests* (or *Presbyters*), and *Deacons*. In early times they were known as *Apostles*, *Bishops* (or *Presbyters*), and *Deacons*. The change in designation resulted, in all probability, from a pious wish to appropriate the term *Apostle* to the first heralds of the Gospel and earliest rulers of the Church; and, consequently, the word *Bishop* was subsequently elevated, as it were, to designate the highest order. Thus, those who are now styled Bishops formerly bore the honoured title of Apostles, since they discharged that portion of the Apostles' functions which consists of the governance of the Church, including the power of ordination. It is but the requirement of common-sense that, in the investigation of the Scriptures, to ascertain whether they countenance the doctrine of imparity, we should keep in mind, not the present, but the primitive nomenclature, and search the Scriptures, not to see if there are therein described the different orders of 'Bishop, Priest, and Deacon,' but of Apostle, Bishop, and Deacon.

Does not the true view, in its fulness, now burst upon the mind of even the moderately instructed in Sacred Scripture? No one will deny that there were in the early Church Apostles—Church officers of the highest rank—to whom Bishops (or Presbyters) and Deacons were subordinate. Hence, there can be no hesitation in positively deciding that imparity, and not equality, was the established Church government of apostolic times; established, if it be necessary to go higher, or if we could, for the Spirit of Christ directed the Apostles, even by our Lord Himself, who ordained Apostles as the superior officers of His Church. As there can be no dispute about the superior rank of the Apostle to that of Presbyter, so there is none as to the inferiority of the

Diaconate to the Presbyterate. Indeed, so fully do Dissenters acknowledge this, that forced by the necessity of the case, in order to maintain the erroneous idea of parity they deny to the Deacon any position in the ministry of the Word, and make him merely a secular officer. This may be the place to remark that, though I have employed Presbyter (or Priest) to designate the second order of ministers, I have done so in conformity with established usages; but the word is not found in the English translation of the Bible. In this, 'Elder' is invariably the translation of the Greek *Presbuteros—i.e.*, Presbyter. The importance of this remark arises from the strange distinction some have made between Presbyter and Elder, with whom the Presbyter is an ordained minister, and the Elder an ordained layman—a distinction thoroughly unscriptural—the Presbyter, in the Scriptures, being the Elder, and the Elder the Presbyter; this latter being only the Greek form of the English Elder.

Who were the Apostles, and what their number? The twelve, ordained by Christ Himself while on earth, in whose number a vacancy occurred by the fall of Judas. Into his place and office was Matthias chosen, after lots were cast, the matter having been left to the Lord's special decision; so that Matthias also was specially appointed by Christ Himself. We must not overlook the language in which the Scriptures speak of the office of Apostle. Peter, quoting the Psalms, says—'His bishoprick let another take.' The Greek word here is *Episcope*, from which our English Episcopacy. Thus, the Holy Spirit designates the Apostolic office 'a bishoprick,' and consequently the Apostles were Bishops; therefore, the application of Bishop to a successor of the Apostles, as is now done, is in accordance with Scripture precedent. The same word is employed by St. Paul in 1 Tim. ii. 1, 2—'If a man desire the office of

a Bishop, he desireth a good work'—*episcope*, if a man desire an *episcope*—'A Bishop—an *Episcopos*—must be blameless.' No doubt here Paul alludes to the office of the Elder or Presbyter, and describes his necessary qualifications, designating him an Episcopos or Bishop. The reason is seen in the nature of the office, as contained in the very word, which means an Overseer. Thus are the Elders of Ephesus warned—'Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers,' *i.e.*, Bishops—*Episcopous*. Similarly St. Peter writes—'The elders which are among you I exhort . . . . Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof'—*i.e.*, acting as the Bishops thereof. Surely the Apostles also were Overseers, but in a more enlarged application of the word; Overseers over the entire Church, Elders and flock, ministers and laymen. Thus St. Paul writes—'That which cometh upon me daily, the care of all the Churches' (2 Cor. xi. 28). He was the Overseer, or Bishop, of all the Churches of the Gentiles, and under him, as the Bishop, were both Elders and flocks. The Elders were overseers of a particular part of the flock, that part which the Apostle says 'is among you;' and he adds, bearing this in view, 'neither as being lords over God's heritage;' the meaning being as in the literal translation, 'lords over the allotted portions,' *i.e.*, of the flock—the congregations severally over which each Elder was placed, and of which he was to take the oversight. To-day we express the same idea by 'the cure of souls,' an expression which includes in its import Paul's 'taking heed unto the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers.

We must not overlook the important and necessary lesson which the appointment of Matthias to succeed Judas in his Bishopric enforces. An office is not polluted by an unworthy occupant. A wicked Bishop, as was

Judas, affords no reason for the suppression of his office, and no argument against its Divine institution. The Priesthood of old had many unworthy occupants, yet was the office transmitted, as from God, from successor to successor. So the Bishopric of Judas was given to Matthias.

Besides the Twelve, Saul of Tarsus was specially called by Christ to the Apostleship, as he says: 'Not of man, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ and God the Father, who raised Him from the dead' (Gal. i. 1). Thus there were *thirteen* Apostles of Christ, chosen and ordained by Himself, without the intervention of men - that is, of the Church.

Also there were other Apostles. Barnabas, who was Paul's companion in travels. In Acts xiv. 14, we read, 'The Apostles Barnabas and Paul.' Of his call we have no record, unless we so appropriate Acts xiii. 1-3. From the first mention of Him in Acts iv., nothing is recorded of him, save what might be applicable to any faithful Bishop of the present day. He was a Prophet, or Teacher, or both, in the Church of Antioch, and was selected by the Holy Ghost to accompany Paul on his first missionary tour. It cannot be decided that the Apostleship was conferred on him when they 'laid hands on him and Paul, and sent them away.' But if so, his appointment was by the Church, though under the express direction of the Holy Ghost. Yet appointed as Paul was previously by Christ Himself, this act of laying on of hands did not confer the Apostleship on him, and it cannot reasonably be asserted that such was the case with his companion. He must, therefore, have been appointed in ordinary course, as one of the chief governors of the Church. Hence his Apostleship differed materially from that of the Thirteen.

Again, in Phil. ii. 25, Paul writes of Epaphroditus, 'my brother and companion in labour, and fellow-soldier, but

your *apostle*.' In English it is 'messenger.' Again, in 2 Cor. viii. 25, we have, 'or our brethren be inquired of; they are the *Apostles* (messengers) of the Churches, and the glory of Christ.' Why ordinary messengers should be commended in such high terms it is difficult to conceive; but it is not only natural, but highly probable, that those who held a conspicuous place in the Church, and were invested with great authority, should be spoken of in such terms.

Again, in Gal. i. 19, James, the Lord's brother, is called an Apostle. 'Other of the Apostles saw I none, save James, the Lord's brother.' He was not one of the Twelve, and yet is spoken of as one of the Apostles.

Once more, in Rom. xvi. 7, mention is made of Andronicus and Junia, as being 'of note among the Apostles' (see also 1 Thess. ii. 6 compared with i. 1). In 2 Cor. xi. 13, we read of 'false Apostles.'

The distinction between 'Apostles of Christ' and 'Apostles of the Churches,' arises from the difference in the persons by whom they were respectively commissioned and invested with authority. Thus, the Twelve and Paul were 'Apostles of Christ,' whereas, Barnabas and the others were 'Apostles of the Churches.'

I have dwelt on this part of my subject for the purpose of clearly establishing the ministerial imparity which existed in the days of the Apostles, and also that the honoured name of Apostle was not confined to the Thirteen, but was extended to those who shared with them the early labours of the ministry, thus perpetuating that imparity in the Church. This will receive additional confirmation as we proceed. The chief officer of the Seven Churches of Asia is designated 'the Angel of the Church' (Rev. ii. and iii.); a word of similar meaning to Apostle, viz.: *messenger*. We are able to decide that this officer was not a mere Elder, or Bishop, of a congregation, but one over many Elders. In Acts xx., we

read that Paul, the then Apostle over that and other Churches, the Prelate, summons the Elders of Ephesus to Miletus. Recognising his authority, they obey the summons. In the language of the present day, he held a visitation of that Diocese. He delivered to them a charge. He thus performed one of the functions which a Bishop now discharges to his clergy. Our point, then, is—there were *many* Elders in the Church of Ephesus, and there was *one* angel—'unto the angel of the Church of Ephesus write'—one evidently over the Church, responsible for its well-being, exercising authority—one whom we at present call the Bishop. Can we conjecture any reason for the change from Apostle to angel as the designation of the highest officer of the Church? May it not be this? The two words have a similar import, but the Lord having specially designated the Twelve Apostles, here intimates His will that this title should be appropriated exclusively to those whom He Himself directly commissioned; and the other be applied to their successors, ordained by the medium of man—the similarity of meaning pointing out the similarity of office discharged by them. I only say this *may* be the reason for the change. Here there is again imparity—a number of Elders, Presbyters, Priests, or Bishops, whichever word we use, presided over by one designated 'the Angel.'

The case of James, 'the brother of the Lord,' has an important bearing on our subject. Ecclesiastical writers, without exception, assert that he was Bishop, *i.e.*, Apostle of Jerusalem; hence his Epistle was addressed to the 'twelve tribes which are scattered abroad.' Do the Scriptures afford any intimation of this distinction as appertaining to him? In Acts xii., we read of Peter's miraculous deliverance from prison. On his admission to the house of Mary, when many were praying at midnight, he hurriedly 'declared unto them how the

Lord had brought him out of prison,' intending at once to go to some place of safety; but before his departure, he directed them to 'go and show these things unto James and the brethren.' Why James? Why is he specified, if he held no office entitling him thereto? It is evident, from the narrative, that he must have been peculiarly interested in the matter—and this, too, in an official capacity: else, why should he be singled out from those whom we may call the superior Apostles, in a matter so deeply affecting the concerns of the whole Church? He must have been, in common-sense, the chief officer to whom specially the concerns of the Church in Jerusalem were committed. This is strikingly confirmed by his presiding over the Council held in Jerusalem, recorded in Acts 15., when he wound up the discussion, and delivered judgment, and in the language of authority too, 'my sentence is.' Also, on Paul's arrival at Jerusalem (chap. xxi) we are informed that on 'the day following Paul went in unto James; and all the Elders (Presbyters) were present.' Here was a meeting of the Presbytery of Jerusalem; all the ministers were assembled, presided over by James, the Apostle-Bishop. It is not said that Paul went in unto the Presbyters, or Presbytery, but unto James. The structure of the passage implies the official superiority of James over the Elders. No one will dispute the superiority of an Apostle, even such as was James, over Presbyters: but the continued mention of James in connection with the Church of Jerusalem, and of no other Apostle, and in the manner we have seen, can be accounted for rationally on no other hypothesis than that he was appointed permanently over that Church. This is corroborated by an incidental notice by St. Paul in Gal. ii. 12. He writes, 'Before that certain came from James, he (Peter) did eat with the Gentiles.' The words 'from James,' can only mean from the Church of Jerusalem. They cannot

mean from James individually, for a different word in the original would have been employed in this case; and James would act as if he were the sole authority—the Pope of the Church. Why should James be put for the Church if he filled no office as its acknowledged chief officer—if he was not recognised as its visible head—its Prelate? Thus, the testimony of ecclesiastical history is abundantly confirmed by Scripture allusions, and these receive in turn from it their natural elucidation.

Imparity is the order of Divine government. There is not equality in the Kingdom in Heaven. How, then, can there be equality in the Kingdom of Heaven? There is not equality on earth, where God's authority is delegated to man. There was not equality in the earliest age of the Church—the Jewish Theocracy. There was Moses, the civil governor, and under him were twelve princes of the tribes, and seventy Elders. In the ecclesiastical department there was also a threefold imparity. First, over all, there was the High Priest; next the Priest; and then the Levite. Similarly in the days of our Lord, He constituted a threefold ministry. He was the Head; next to Him—chosen from the body of the disciples, after solemn prayer all night—were the Twelve Apostles; then, in the third place, the Seventy other disciples, whom He sent forth to preach, and from which number, in all probability, Matthias was chosen to the higher order of Apostle on the fall of Judas. The similarity of numbers in the Jewish polity and first Christian ministry, *twelve* and *seventy* respectively, must strike every observer.

We are thus prepared for—nay, we naturally expect—an analogous imparity in succeeding ages, until the return of our Lord. Nor are we disappointed. We find it, as we have seen, in the threefold ministry of Apostles, Bishops (or Elders), and Deacons; or, as now, 'Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.' I believe there is no dispute as to the necessity of ministerial imposition of hands to

constitute valid ordination to the ministry, and the controversy about 'Apostolic succession' is not, when correctly understood, as to its existence, but as to the channel through which it comes, whether Bishops or Elders. If imposition of ministerial hands be requisite, there has been succession from the Apostles; if it be not requisite, then ordination may be conferred by the hands of laymen, or lay-women. Nothing is more inconsistent than for those who admit the necessity of ordination by the hands of ministers to rail at Apostolical succession.

The question, then, is: In what officer of the Church is vested the power of ordination to the ministry? It is not necessary to prove here that the Apostles were the first persons commissioned by our Lord to ordain to the ministry, and that without the intervention of others. It could not have been otherwise. The question is then narrowed to this: In the enumeration of the duties imposed upon Elders, is that of ordination specified? Is there any instance recorded in Scripture of ordination by Presbyters? The first of these questions can be answered in the negative without fear of contradiction. Take, for example, Paul's address to the Ephesian Elders (Acts. xx.). If ever there was an occasion on which such an admonition ought to have been given, it was that. The Apostle assembles them for the last time: he warns them against improper Presbyters, who should intrude themselves into the Church, or even arise from among themselves; but not one word escapes his lips as to any caution to be exercised by them in admitting persons into the ministry; a silence altogether unaccountable, on the supposition that the power of ordination was vested in them. His sole exhortation is, 'Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock.'

But while the Scriptures are thus silent as to any duty of the Ephesian Presbyters in the matter of ordination,

they do speak explicitly of the person on whom that duty devolved. Paul wrote two Epistles to Timothy dealing with the work of the ministry, including the ordination of ministers. They describe the necessary qualifications for the offices, respectively, of Bishop—that is, Priest and Deacon. Timothy is directed thus: 'The things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also' (2 Eph. ii. 2).

Instructions are also given to him as to his dealings with ministers, being their judge—'against an Elder (Presbyter) receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses.' As to admission to the ministry, he is told to 'lay hands suddenly on no man.' The Epistles all through proceed on the assumption of Timothy's sole authority over both Presbyters and flock. Thus, not in the Presbyters of Ephesus, but in Timothy, whom Paul besought to abide at Ephesus, for the purpose of watching over, and ruling, the Church (1 Tim. i. 3), was the power of ordination vested.

By whom was Timothy ordained? In 1 Tim. iv. 14, he is exhorted in these words: 'Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery.' Admitting that the word Presbytery here means a body of Presbyters (which is an undecided question), does this verse assert that Timothy was ordained solely by a number of Presbyters? As it is generally, but most erroneously, quoted, it may seem to do so; but, as in the text, it affords no countenance to the opinion. The words are, '*with* the hands of the Presbytery;' as so often quoted, and even in print, it is '*by* the hands.' As in the Bible, it speaks of *an auxiliary;* as quoted, of *an agent* exclusively. Let us admit that the Presbytery here alluded to was the agent in Timothy's ordination, was no Prelate, no officer superior to Presbyters, no Apostle

present, who took part in the work? We have already seen that over the meeting of Presbytery mentioned in Acts xxi. 18. James, the Apostle, presided. It is not likely that on such an important occasion as an ordination the Presbyters were left to themselves. But if there were no Apostle present, then ordination is not vested in our Bishops; if there was, this text affords no countenance to ordination by Presbyters. For argument's sake, it would be quite sufficient to question the assumption that a Presbytery was, in those days, a court composed *exclusively* of Presbyters—that is, of those who had been advanced no higher in the ministry. This is an assumption altogether unprovable, and yet it must be proved before we can admit that this verse establishes the Scriptural character of Presbyterian ordination. However, I stand not on this logical position, inasmuch as the 2nd Epistle to Timothy declares that the Apostle St. Paul laid his hands on Timothy, and no mention is made of anyone else joining in the rite; an omission fatal to the passage in the 1st Epistle, constituting the ground of Presbyterian ordination. The statement is this: 'I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God which is in thee by the putting (laying) on my hands.' If we couple this passage with that in the 1st Epistle, they will stand thus: 'By the putting on of my hands, with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery;' that is, the Apostle's hands as the agent, and the hands of the Presbytery as the auxiliary, or assistant, and yet not as the indispensable assistant. I may remark that this is the mode of ordination of Presbyters of the Churches of England and Ireland: 'the bishop, with the Priests present, shall lay their hands severally upon the heads of everyone that receiveth the order of Priesthood' —*Rubric in the Service.*

But does 1 Tim. iv. 14, refer to Timothy's ordination? This requires proof, and it will be seen that unless this be

proved it is exceedingly dangerous to base ordination at all upon it. All laying on of hands was not ordination. In Acts xiii., Paul and Barnabas were by imposition of hands appointed to go on a missionary tour—a work which, we are told, they fulfilled, and then returned to Antioch. Saul's appointment to the Apostleship took place on his journey to Damascus; and he informs us himself, was not 'of men, neither by man;' and Barnabas had been preaching previously. This appointment was made by the Church in accordance with the direct command of the Holy Ghost. 'The Holy Ghost said, separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them.' A special work, it will be seen.

May not 'the laying on of hands' of 1 Tim. iv. 14, be analogous to this of Acts. xiii.? And the 'prophecy' (which is Word of the Holy Ghost) answer to 'the Holy Ghost said'? And this 'laying on of the hands of the Presbytery' be the appointment of Timothy for a special work?

Sometimes it is rashly attempted to enlist Acts xiii. into the cause of mere Presbyterian ordination, by asserting that it records the ordination of Barnabas and Saul by a number of hands, which are further asserted to have been 'the hands of a Presbytery,' meaning, thereby, a number of men who were Presbyters, or Elders, and of no higher grade. Here is a strange forgetfulness of facts. Barnabas and Saul were already Apostles, and, along with others, 'Prophets and Teachers,' 'they ministered to the Lord' as such. But stranger still: If these ministers were only Presbyters, we have Presbyters ordaining to the highest office in the ministry—the Apostleship. What Presbyters did then, surely their successors can do now? Why do they not? We must ever bear in mind that among the ministers of Antioch there were at least two Apostles. It must also be remembered that the Apostles were all Elders. He that

fills the highest office also fills the lowest. So Peter calls himself 'An Elder' (1 Epistle v. 1); therefore a meeting of Presbytery might have been composed exclusively of Apostles, or of Apostles and Elders; and as now, of Bishops and Priests. Thus the word 'Presbytery' decides nothing.

We have another instance of ordination recorded in Scripture, and declared to have been by St. Paul himself. He thus writes to Titus: 'For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee' (i. 5). Besides the announcement of Titus' ordination by Paul (not by a Presbytery), we have other important matter noted in this passage. Titus was left in Crete to set in order the things that had been left undone in the Church there. Why not direct the Presbytery of each city to discharge this duty? He was also to 'ordain elders in every city.' We ask again, why not instruct the Presbytery to this effect? A Church had been planted in the island by the Apostle himself, whose practice was 'to ordain Elders in every Church' (Acts xiv. 23). And, now, instead of directing the Elders of Crete to add to their number, he commissions an individual to do so. If it be argued there were no Elders at the time, we answer there was a Church, and a Church could not have existed without Elders; and Titus was only to complete what was left unfinished—intimating, as the language does, that much had been done; and reason tells us that the very first thing must have been the appointment of Elders to teach and rule the Church. We may add this to our argument, that if there were no Elders in Crete at the time, it is evident Titus was not assisted in the work by a Presbytery, and consequently the Presbytery of Crete did not receive Presbyterian ordination. Thus, from the cases of Timothy and Titus, and from the ordinations conferred by them respectively

in Ephesus and Crete, Episcopal ordination is established on a Scriptural basis.

It is necessary, now, to refer briefly to the office of the Deacon. The Epistle to the Philippians is addressed to the 'Saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the Bishops and Deacons.' Here we have the threefold ministry. We have Paul, the Prelate, with authority over both ordinary ministers and people, and we have these ministers consisting of 'Bishops (or Priests) and Deacons.' The qualifications necessary for a Deacon are enumerated by St. Paul in his 1st Epistle to Timothy—qualifications little less, if any, than those of Presbyters. One is specified which, undoubtedly, proves that Deacons were expected in time to rise to the higher office of Presbyter: that the Diaconate was a step to the Priesthood—and that is, *a capacity to rule*. Of Presbyters it is enjoined that they 'rule well their own house, having their children in subjection with all gravity.' The reason of this is assigned: 'For if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the Church of God?' So, in like manner, must 'Deacons rule their children and their own houses well.' And for this reason 'For they that have used the office of a Deacon well, purchase to themselves a good degree' (or step). They are entitled to rise to the office of Presbyter, whose duty it is to rule, as well as to teach.

One great impediment to a proper view of the Diaconate is the assumption, it must be confessed almost universal, that it had its origin in the circumstances recorded in Acts vi., the seven persons there appointed to distribute the alms of the Church being considered the first Deacons. Hence it was found necessary to establish some spiritual function as discharged by them. The attempt appears to me, to say the least of it, awkward. Stephen and Philip preached; therefore the office of preaching was connected with the distribution of alms. Such is the argument.

The more rational way of accounting for their preaching is, that they also filled the office of Evangelist. Nor are we left to conjecture on the point in the case of Philip, who subsequently is expressly designated 'Philip the Evangelist.' We may, therefore, safely conclude that Stephen also was an Evangelist, it not being incompatible with the work of a mere preacher to 'serve tables,' while it is altogether unsuitable for one whose sole business is 'prayer and the ministry of the Word.' In the original there is peculiar force, the same word being applied both to 'Tables' and 'the Word;' so that there are the Diaconate of 'Tables,' and the Diaconate of 'the Word.' If these seven men are, then, correctly termed Deacons, they were Deacons of Tables, while the Deacons of St. Paul's Epistle are Deacons of the Word. Thus, Paul designates the preaching of the Gospel a Deaconship. He says, 'That I might finish my course with joy, and the ministry—deaconship—which I have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the gospel of the grace of God' (Acts xx. 24). Timothy is exhorted to 'do the work of an Evangelist, and make full proof of this ministry,' *fulfil thy deaconship*. Thus, this deaconship, or ministry, is 'the work of the Evangelist,' even 'to preach the Word,' a duty thus strongly, solemnly, and strictly enjoined on the highest ministers in the Church. I cannot but express a hope that the time is not far distant when Bishops, as well as Priests and Deacons, will preach the Word not only in Churches, but also in school-houses and barns, and in the highways and hedges of our land.

I have spoken of the present Bishops as successors of the Apostles. This may be misunderstood, and therefore requires some explanation. Indeed, this explanation might be gathered from what has been already said. There were two classes of Apostles, those appointed directly by Christ Himself, and those appointed by the Churches. The former held an office in which there

could be no successors. It was a needful qualification for that office that the holder should have seen the Lord after He rose from the dead, and hence be a witness of His resurrection. Thus, as a successor to Judas, Peter says, 'must one be ordained to be a witness with us of His resurrection' (Acts i. 22). To this Paul appeals, 'Am I not an Apostle? Have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord?' (1 Cor. ix. 1). These Apostles had the power of working miracles, and by imposition of hands of conferring the Holy Ghost. It is manifest that such powers ceased with the death of the Twelve and Paul. There is no record in the Scriptures of others after them exercising such powers. Their office was confined to themselves, so far as such powers are concerned. In it they have no successors.

But it is not so in the case of the Apostles of the Churches, those who were appointed by the others to rule and to teach, and thus, in these respects, to continue the office down to futurity; and this is done in our present Bishops, who are the successors of the Apostles as Rulers and Teachers, having authority to appoint to the various orders of the ministry. And, so far as Presbyters rule and teach those portions of the flock entrusted to their care, they are in the succession from the Apostles. Thus Apostolic succession, properly understood, is simply ministerial succession from the Apostles.

There is another point connected with the subject which cannot be passed over in silence. In his statements to Timothy, St. Paul refers to a special gift bestowed on Timothy at his ordination—that is, assuming that his ordination is referred to in the passages. He speaks of it as a 'gift that is in thee, given thee with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery;' again, 'the gift of God which is in thee by the putting on of my hands.' This cannot possibly mean merely the office that was conferred upon him. It was 'a gift *in* him';

therefore an internal spiritual gift connected with the office, and a necessary qualification for the discharge of its duties. Do Presbyters claim the power of bestowing this internal spiritual gift in ordination? If so, they must admit that this power has been transmitted from age to age, from the days of the Apostles to the present time; and this is a claim for Apostolic succession in the particular that has met with most opposition, and even ridicule, from Nonconformists. If they make no such claim, they cannot base their ordination on 1 Tim. iv. 14.

The Church of Rome claims this power absolutely, and some of our own members join them in the claim. Let me state the view that appears to me to be the true one. We must carefully distinguish between the office and the qualification necessary for its discharge. The office may be bestowed on one who has no qualification for it, yet all his ministerial acts are valid. Man may bestow the office; God alone the qualification. Does He in *every* case of admission by man to the office grant the qualification? To this I cannot but answer, No! Only in some.

In the course of our Ordination Services, the candidate for the order of Deacon is thus interrogated:

'Do you trust that you are inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon you this office and ministration to serve God, for the promoting of His glory and the edifying of His people?

'*Answer.*—I trust so.

'Do you think that you are truly called according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ to the ministry of the Church?

'*Answer.*—I think so.'

Similarly in the case of Priests:

'Do you think in your heart that you be truly called according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ to the order and ministry of Priesthood?

'*Answer.*—I think it.'

Here the inner call of the Holy Ghost is recognised, and the candidate ordained, only on the presumption that he is so called. And in such case can we for a moment doubt that God, who calls to the ministry, will grant the needful grace—'the gift in thee' when His authorized officers lay on their hands? In other cases, when men intrude into the ministry uncalled by Him, can we imagine that He bestows the grace? I cannot so think. For that would be to—might I say?—compel God to qualify, it might be, even the hypocrite, for an office into which He has not willed him to be admitted.

Another remark before I close. The words Prelate and Prelacy are much objected to. In fact, they are bugbears used to frighten the unthinking. Prelate means simply one set over others; preferred to others. It does not imply autocratic authority. Our Bishops are called Prelates, solely because they are set over other ministers. They are constitutional rulers, bound to rule the Church according to the Church's laws, made by herself.

I have thus endeavoured to establish my position, that the Episcopal is the Scriptural form of Church government, with its threefold orders of ministers. I am aware that while I have omitted many matters, both interesting and important, I have not treated others as fully as they deserve. My desire was concentration and simplicity, and I think, yet with all humility, that I have submitted sufficient considerations to confirm the conviction that the Church of Ireland is Scriptural and Apostolic in its form of government, as in its dogma. The latter is the all-important matter; without true, Scriptural doctrine, a Church, however perfectly constituted, is an *ignis fatuus*, a will-o'-the-wisp, which will lead to ruin. Therefore, far better a Church imperfectly constituted, teaching the Truth, than a perfectly constituted Church which teaches falsehood. Churchism, even that enjoined in Scripture, is only for a time; it will pass away with the era for which

it was instituted; it will not save the soul, and it might have been different had God so willed. Whereas truth will abide for ever. It is the Truth which saves the sinner. The Truth is unchangeable; it could not have been other than it is. Churchism is but the casquet that contains the jewel. How wretched the man that makes the casquet and the jewel change places in his estimation—who is busied about the former to the neglect, or contempt, of the latter—or who spurns the jewel unless enclosed in the casquet! Churchism is but for a time. An age is coming in which no Churchism will be known—such as now obtains among us—but when there will be a glorious kingdom, over which He, who is emphatically 'the Truth,' will reign for ever.

While, then, we boast of a Church whose government is Scriptural, let us boast still more of this: that it teaches the Truth. Yet not rest satisfied with even this; rest not satisfied until, individually and personally, we all rejoice in the Truth for its own sake; until, looking up to Him who died and rose again for us, and now liveth, the Church's glorious Head, enamoured of His loveliness, and entranced by the beauty and power of the Truth, in the deepest and sincerest emotions of our inner life, we can exclaim—'Whom have I in heaven but Thee? And there is none upon earth that I desire beside Thee.'

THE CHURCH—WHAT IS IT?*

THERE are but few among us who entertain any clear, definite idea of the Church—few who could give an intelligent answer to the question, What is the Church? In most minds the idea is an abstraction, of which we have sufficient proof in the expression, 'Our mother the Church,' the absurdity of which designation may be gathered from this lecture as being tantamount to calling ourselves our own mother.

Perhaps no word in our language is employed with a greater latitude of application than Church, and not improperly, when we take into account the import of the term. It is of Greek origin, and differs very little in sound from its original. The Greek word for Lord is *Kurios*, and its adjective *Kuriakos:* in English, 'the Lord's,' or 'belonging to the Lord.' Hence, it may be applied, we at once see, to anything appertaining to Him exclusively, and is so applied in the New Testament. Thus, 1 Cor. x. 21, 'the cup of the Lord,' 'the Lord's table'; xi. 20, 'the Lord's Supper'; Rev. i. 10, 'the Lord's day.' In the first two instances the word is *Kurios;* in the latter, *Kuriakos.* Now, we might employ our English word Church, and say, with the utmost propriety, *the Church* cup, *the Church* table, *the Church* day,

* This lecture was originally delivered before the Church of Ireland Young Men's Society, Belfast, on December 7, 1864, and was then published at the request of that Society. As here printed, it is slightly altered from the original.

understanding in each case, *that which belongs to the Lord.* With this warrant, both from Scripture and common-sense, we are correct in designating the place devoted to the worship of the Lord *a Church.* In fact, it is so done universally, the house of prayer being called 'the Lord's house,' *i.e.*, the Church house. The Scottish *Kirk* is only another form of the word, and perhaps nearer the original.

It is remarkable that a totally different Greek word has had 'the Church' assigned to it as its English equivalent. The word *ecclesia*, from which is formed 'ecclesiastical,' strictly denotes a meeting or assembly of persons called together (*called out* from others) for any purpose whatever. Thus, in Acts xix. 32, 39, 41, 'The *assembly* was confused. If ye inquire anything concerning other matters, it shall be determined in a lawful *assembly*. And when he had thus spoken, he dismissed the *assembly*' (or meeting). Hence its application to 'the Lord's people.' They are 'called out' from a godless world; separated from it both externally and internally; formed into a society bearing His name, holding His faith, and subject to His laws. This is the meeting, the assembly, the congregation of the Lord—the Church.

In the New Testament the word designates the Lord's people either in the aggregate or some specified portion of them, or as assembled for worship. In the first, and its widest application, it denotes all the Lord's people from first to last, as forming one corporate body; sometimes that portion alive on the earth at any particular period—'the Holy Church throughout all the world.' In the second, a more limited number, as National Churches, viz.: 'The Church at Jerusalem' (Acts viii. 1); 'the Churches of Galatia' (Gal. i. 2); 'the Church of the Thessalonians' (1 Thess. i. 1); 'the Seven Churches in Asia' (Rev. i. 4). In its third application, as in 1 Cor. xi. 18, 22, 'When ye come together in the Church.' 'Despise

ye the Church of God?' Or, as in Col. iv. 15, 'The Church in the house of Nymphas,' *i.e.*, the few wont to meet there for worship, and when so assembled. In Acts vii. 38, the Hebrew nation is designated 'the Church.'

This suggests a thought as to the names whereby particular Churches should be designated. The Scriptures recognise only *National* Churches. They give no countenance to the modern custom of calling Churches after their form of government or their peculiar dogmas. We do not read therein of the Episcopal Church, the Presbyterian Church, the Independent Church, the Methodist Church, the Baptist Church. It follows Scripture precedent and warrant to use the names Church of England, Church of Ireland, Church of Scotland.

Although the Church is separated from the world both externally and internally, these are not necessarily identical, so that he who is externally and by profession a member, is also such internally and in reality. Accordingly, the members of the Church are naturally divided into those who are members in the sight of God and those who are members in the sight of men; the former being, however, included in the latter, as in an inner circle which God alone can see and determine. The two sacraments are the Divinely appointed external marks; so that he who partakes of them is, in the sight of man, a member of the Church, and must be regarded and treated as such by men.

The 'remission of sins by spiritual regeneration' (*i.e.*, justification), and the new birth of the spirit in the soul, are the internal marks, and are those which, in truth and alone, effectually separate from the world, and enrol among the people of the Lord, the Church.

Hence we are accustomed to distinguish between the visible and the invisible Church; more correctly, the Church as visible and invisible to the eye of man, and as

the latter visible only to the eye of God. The Scriptures treat of but one Church, having, as it were, an upper and an under suface—the upper its aspect *quo ad* God, the latter its aspect *quo ad* man. While God must see and deal with it in both aspects, it is manifest man can deal with it only in its earthly aspect. Hence, man's judgment and conduct must be regulated by the external marks; God's by the internal.

The Church, hence called Catholic, consists of all who are baptized into the name of Christ: that is, all who in and by His own appointed ordinance for that end, take His name upon them, and bear it from that day forward. All so bearing His name are privileged to introduce their children into the community of the Church, inasmuch as the children of only one believing parent are 'holy,' or separated from the world unto God. (1 Cor. vii. 14.) Prior to their baptism they are not members. The Church is thus perpetuated from age to age by the sacraments.

There was a time when the Church was not visible on earth, no sacraments having been ordained by God, and when, consequently, no profession of His faith was made by any but His true followers. The Lord's people were not then gathered out and formed into a society or Church. They lived as units, as individual believers, the father of a family acting as its priest, as in the instance of Job. A change was made when God chose Abraham, and entered into special covenant with him and with his seed. He gave them the covenant of circumcision—the first sacrament ordained by Him, the first external mark of discipleship. Then was the Church, as a visible society, instituted.

It was a fundamental law of the Church, so visible that the infants of its members should be admitted into it. So strongly did the Lord maintain this law, and insist on its fulfilment, that He annexed a heavy penalty to its omis-

sion in the case of the male infant not circumcised at eight days old, who was declared to be a breaker of God's covenant, and was to be cut off from his people, although the fault of the transgression could not possibly have been his own (Gen. xvii. 14).

The Church was thus perpetuated to the days of our Lord and His Apostles, being confined to one nation, which God calls 'His people, His own, holy, peculiar,' and this notwithstanding idolatries, apostasies, iniquities, which compelled Him at length to cast them off. They were 'holy' by their consecration in circumcision to His service, marked off from all other people; 'holy,' as being the Church, although it was but an external holiness.

When the time arrived in which 'God did visit the Gentiles to take out of them a people for His Name' (Acts xv. 14), no longer confining His choice to one nation, a change was effected in the rite of admission into the Church, baptism being substituted for circumcision. No other change took place in the fundamental principles of the Church. The law enjoining the admission of infants was not repealed. It is sometimes asked what authority from the New Testament have we for the baptism of infants? Not admitting its absence, we reply, none is necessary; and we ask, can you prove the repeal of the law which commanded their admission into the Church? The change of rite argues no change of age. A simple illustration will forcibly point this out. The Queen commands her subjects to be presented to her at ten years of age, each clothed in a scarlet robe. Subsequently she issues an ordinance that the colour shall be changed, and purple substituted for scarlet. Can any question arise as to age? None; it remains the same. So God, instituting a visible Church, commanded infants to be admitted in the garb of circumcision. In after-years He substituted baptism for circumcision. Can a question fairly

arise as to age? Has He repealed the law, and altered the age?

Such a question has arisen, notwithstanding, but on an assumption which is directly against Scripture. Yet, analogy would reason, even if the assumption were true, that infants are still eligible for admission to the Church, unless positive prohibition exist, which there does not. It is said that baptism is altogether of a different character from circumcision: 'It is a sign and seal of faith,' and how can faith exist in infants? The answer is, the same is said of circumcision in Rom. iv. 11, 'He' (Abraham) 'received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had.' In Col. ii. 11, 12, both rites are placed in juxtaposition as importing the same thing, 'the putting off the body of the sins of the flesh'; and most plainly did both represent this; and the Colossian Gentile Christians are declared to have been spiritually circumcised when baptized. This branch of the subject must not now be pursued further.

The assumption to which I have referred as being opposed to Scripture is, that our Lord established a new Church, entirely distinct from that which preceded His coming. Sometimes the error goes even to the length of asserting that there was no Church before the Lord's advent. Hence such expressions as 'the Jewish Church,' 'the Christian Church,' as if the Jewish Church were not Christian, *i.e.*, the Church of Christ in the Mosaic dispensation, the Church of Christ and of God. Latterly the formula has become notorious, 'the Church of the New Testament' cutting off entirely the Church of the Old—a very unhappy title, and very unscriptural. However, there is a point in it, and its framers require what is implied by it to establish their views of the Church.

The Scriptures do not speak of *two* Churches, but of *one*, under two dispensations, and in different circumstances: the Church as instituted in Abraham, and

limited for centuries to his descendants, enlarging its boundaries in the days of the Apostles to receive within them men out of every nation. The same Church enlarged, the same fundamental principles continued, the rites of admission altered to suit the altered circumstances of the Church, little change in its government being necessary, although the character of its services underwent considerable change.

Two illustrations of the Scriptures will close this part of my subject. In Rom. xi. the Church is compared to an olive-tree, some of whose branches (not all) have been broken off, and others grafted in their place—the broken off branches being unbelieving Israelites; the engrafted, believing Gentiles. To the engrafted Gentiles St. Paul writes: 'Thou being a wild olive-tree wast grafted in among the branches, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive-tree. Boast not against the branches, . . . thou bearest not the root, but the root thee.' Everything here, except the grafts, is Jewish—the stock, the root, the fatness. The Church is the old Jewish one (if we must use the phrase) into which believing Gentiles are admitted, to share its spiritual blessings—the adoption, the glory, the covenants, the law, the service of God, the promises—all which pertain to Israel (Rom. x. 4), being 'their spiritual things' (Rom. xv. 27). Here we see no new olive-tree planted, new root, stock, sap—but the old receiving Gentile grafts to share its fatness.

The other illustration is in Gal. iv. It is that of an heir to an estate. An age is fixed by the father as that at which the heir is to enter into possession. Up to this time he differs nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all, being under tutors and governors; but as soon as the appointed age arrives he is free from the schoolmaster, and takes possession. He is not *two* individuals, but *one* in two different positions, and under different

circumstances. 'Even so we' (the Church), says the Apostle, 'when we were children were in bondage under the elements of the world (the law); but when the fulness of the time was come (the time fixed in God's counsel) God sent forth His son . . . that we might receive the adoption of sons. . . Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son, and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ.' Thus we read not of two Churches, but of one in different circumstances: first as a minor, a child under age, as being under the law; then as the same child arrived at maturity of age, under the freedom of the Gospel. This is confirmed by Paul's reasoning in Rom. iv., where he designates Abraham 'the father of us all' who believe, who have the faith of Abraham, and who are, along with Abraham, the heirs of the promise made by God to Abraham. The one faith, the one promise, the one Father of the one faithful family. As it is said in Gal. iii. 29: 'If ye be Christ's then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise.'

Reverting to the question of admission. When first it was instituted the Church was in a time of Gospel liberty. Abraham was not under the law, but under a promise, which was the Gospel. The law was not given, nor the Church placed under it until 430 years after Abraham; and the law may be considered a parenthesis in the dealings of God with the Church, as fully reasoned out in Gal. iii. Hence, in the command to Abraham, to bring infants into the Church, into covenant relation to God, we have a Gospel command which has not been repealed, and which, consequently, remains in force to this day.

It has been already remarked that sacraments are connected with the Church as visible, and are for man's judgment of man—marks given by God for those who cannot discern the heart of man; yet, though outward, not arbitrarily instituted, but with a suitable correspondency to internal things, outward symbols of internal graces,

between which, though not essentially connected, 'there is a spiritual relation or sacramental union: whence it comes to pass that the names and effects of the one are attributed to the other' (*Westminster Confession of Faith*, chap. xxvii.). This simply means that 'the name and effects' of the inward grace are attributed to the symbol or sign, as if they were its 'name and effects.' On this principle, so clearly and so soundly thus expressed in the Presbyterian Standard of faith, baptism, or the effects of it, is said to be regeneration, though this is truly the effect of the inward grace alone. Thus Saul is commanded to 'arise and be baptized, and wash away his sins' Acts xxii. 16); although, through faith in Christ, as he saw Him on the way to Damascus, these sins had been already washed away by the blood of Jesus. In Rom. vi. 4 we are said to be 'buried with Christ by baptism into death;' and in Gal. iii. 27, that as 'baptized into Christ we put on Christ.' In these instances 'the name and effects' of that signified are attributed to the sign. All this being clear, from the fact before stated, that sacraments are for the Church as a visible society—God allowing no man to sit in judgment on the conscience and internal state of his brother. This He reserves for Himself, His own prerogative. When, then, the decision of the Church is pronounced over the baptized that He is regenerate, it proceeds on the principle above so fully explained, and so intelligibly expressed in the *Westminster Confession*, and has respect only to the Church as visible.

The Church is the body of Christ: He is the Head, and all believers are members (Eph. i. 22, 23). But what Church? How important the correct understanding of this is evident from the different applications of the word. Christ has but one body, and whatever Church is that body, all others are excluded. Moreover, all the members of that specific Church are saved; as being

members of His body none can be lost. Is it the universal Church visible which constitutes His body? No one will say so. Is it some National or Dissenting Church? No one, after a moment's calm reflection, will assert this either; for this would be to pronounce the undoubted salvation of every member of that Church, and the as certain damnation of the members of all other Churches. This is indeed what the Roman Church does: claiming to be the Catholic Church, she asserts that she is the body of Christ, and that all her members and none others shall be saved. We should be cautious lest any Protestant Church should be guilty of the same terrible and unscriptural error, and claim the exclusive right to Christ as its Head, to the exclusion of all others. All Protestant Churches, as Churches, are so separate from each other, holding no Church communion with each other, that what may with truth be asserted of one may not necessarily be true of any other. So that if Christ be the Head of any particular Church or sect, He is not, and cannot be, the Head of any other, or He must have more bodies than one. Such conduct, so sect-glorifying, is strongly condemned by St. Paul in 1 Cor. i. 12, 13, and iii. 3. Here we read of this very error, as committed by some in Corinth, who said, 'We are of Christ,' excluding thus all others from Christ, and Christ from them. They were met by a sharp and pointed rebuke: 'Is Christ divided?' 'Are ye not carnal and walk as men?'

No. The Church as visible is not, nor is any section of the Church, national or congregational, the body of Christ. Of what Church, then, is it that He is so its Head—that it, and it alone, is His body? This can be true only of that Church which is invisible to us, 'the Church of the first-born which are written in heaven.' (Heb. xii. 23.). The members of this Church are certainly known to God alone. His eye alone can see them as separated internally by the Spirit from others;

yea, even from those who may bear His name, and who may seem unto men to be His, while having 'neither part nor lot in this matter.' This Church is composed of all who, from the fall of Adam to the second coming of our Lord, are truly converted to God, born again of the Spirit—born from above—of the incorruptible seed of God. It is a Church not yet complete; many of its members are yet unborn even in the flesh; but when complete, the last member gathered out of this naughty world, then will the full union of the Head and body be consummated; the marriage of the Lamb will then be come, his wife having made herself ready. (Rev. xix. 7.) This is that Church, every soul within whose pale shall be saved. This is the Church of the Bible, Old and New Testament alike. It is no harmless, no trivial, error for any Church or sect to claim to be 'the Church of the New Testament.' There is an aggregation of unscriptural errors in the claim, as is evident from the course of this argument. There should be no mistake on this point.

The relationship of the members to Christ, as the body of which He is the Head, is one of nature, one of life; life flowing from the Head to, and through, the members, uniting and keeping in union the several parts of the body. It is grace derived from the Head that first quickens the dead soul into spiritual life, and bestows on it capacity for the inheritance of the saints in light. It is by continued communion with Him that it grows in spiritual health and strength, and in ability for the service and enjoyment of God.

But, alas! how little is the essential feature of Churchism which characterizes this union with Him, the Head, apprehended at the present day! We hear much of High Church, Low Church, Broad Church; but this feature is disregarded. I allude to the unity, the oneness of the members, which constitutes a main attribute of the Church. This is powerfully and simply

taught in 1 Cor. xii. The chapter opens with instruction relative to the imparted gifts of the Holy Spirit, the chief point in which is the general distribution of the gifts through the Church—one to one, another to another—but to no one all, and this for the profit of all; no one gifted for his exclusive advantage, but for that of the body at large. The Church required all, and to the Church all were given, but distributed to every man severally as God willed. Thus individualism was excluded, and selfishness guarded against, the members being taught to regard themselves as parts of one great whole, each needing the other, and all mutually depending on one another. Thus, the good of one was the good of all, and the injury of one the injury of all.

This is enforced by the homely and telling illustration of the human body. There is a head, and there are members—many members, possessing different qualities and powers, and having different offices to discharge, yet none for itself alone, because all form, with the body proper, one body, and all from the very necessity of nature bound to work for the common good of all: 'and whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member be honoured, all the members rejoice with it.' Continuing his illustration, the Apostle notes how 'on the less honourable members we bestow more abundant honour,' and how 'our uncomely parts have more abundant comeliness,' for 'God hath tempered the body together, having given more abundant honour to that part which lacked, that there should be no schism in the body, but that the members should have the same care one for another.

'So also is Christ.' Even He is not alone, a unit. He is a corporate body, with all those who have the Holy Spirit. Together they constitute a unit—a whole, of which He is the Head and they the members, with mutual relationships and dependence; to have the same

care one of the other; to rejoice in the good of each other, for it is the good of the body, each member being honoured in the honour bestowed on the others, and the injury of one being the injury of all. Hence there should be no selfish individualism, but a union of mutual care and interest in the welfare of each other and of the whole. No envy, no jealousy at the prosperity of any member, as the hand cannot envy the prosperity of the foot, nor the eye that of the hand. And this oneness is proclaimed and visibly cemented in our baptism, wherein we are constituted one Body, one family, with one Spirit, one hope, one God and Father of all. Oh, if we did realize this unity so as to carry it into action, what an absence would there be of those bickerings, jealousies, dissensions, which mar the Church of Christ at the present day!

In another sense Christ is the head of the Church, and there is another relationship than that of a body in which the Church stands to Him as such. The sad confusion of ideas which mingles these together is the cause of these ungenerous attacks so frequently made against one section of the Church by another. In the relationship now referred to, the Church must be understood in its widest latitude, and in every application of the word, as well visible as invisible, universal as particular, national or congregational. This relationship is thus expressed, as in a passage already specified (Eph. i. 22), Christ is 'Head over all things to the Church, which is His body.' The 'all things' are not His body, but He is 'Head over all things' for His body's sake. He stands to all things as their Head—as the source of all authority, and having all authority over them; and 'all things' are to Him subordinate, whether they be things in heaven or things on earth—thrones, dominions, principalities, powers; 'all power in heaven and earth is given unto Him.' No power, no lawful authority is exercised on earth that is not His—of Him. 'There is no power but of God'

(Rom. xiii. 1). From the mightiest monarch to the humblest tax-gatherer, all are God's ministers, dispensing His delegated authority among men. He who formed men into societies, whether kingdoms, families, or Churches, knowing that society cannot exist without authority, permitted man from the first to rule over man, the husband over the wife, the parent over the child, the master over the servant, the minister or pastor over the flock; these, as well as the king over his subjects. To each He gave of His own authority, as 'Head over all things.' Nor is there any lawful authority, in any relationship of life, that flows not from Him as Head, it matters not who the individual is who exercises it.

Christ as 'Head over all things' is Head of the Church (and of every portion thereof), which derives its authority exclusively from Him as such Head. He rules it, although invisibly, moulding the minds of men, both within and without its bounds, guiding them in ways they know not of; all for the accomplishment of His own wise ends, His own glory in the salvation of His people. He instituted ordinances, and prescribed the discipline of the Church, committing to it very extensive powers of government, declaring that whatever the Church should bind or loose on earth should be ratified in heaven (Matt. xvi. 19; xviii. 18.). And after His resurrection He breathed on His assembled disciples, and said, 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained' (John xx. 22, 23.). These words were addressed, not to the Apostles exclusively (only ten of them were present at the time), but, as we learn from St. Luke's narrative (xxiv. 38), to the disciples then assembled—that is, the Church. They confer on it authority to exercise discipline, an authority continuing to this day—an authority, not as Rome claims to forgive sins as in the sight of God, but, of the Church—for open

transgressions to exclude from the Church, and on penitence to receive offenders back again. Under this commission, then, the Church in its synod enacts laws for its regulation, to which the members are bound before God to yield obedience, provided nothing be enjoined contrary to God's Word written.

In the rule committed to, and enjoined upon, the Church is the office of the pastor, under which the members of the Church bear the relationship of a flock to a shepherd. In this office is the feeding, and guiding, and ruling of the flock. The pastures to which the shepherd is to lead, and on which he is to feed the flock, are the Scriptures, and he is to teach these with authority, and to rebuke with the same. This office is but little at the present day regarded; indeed, there are those who set it aside altogether, who look not up to the minister as a pastor, and seek not to be guided and led by him; who act as if they were at liberty to separate themselves from him, and act altogether independently of him. There has at all times been a tendency in the human mind to slight the rule of the elder or pastor. It exhibited itself early in the Church, which, no doubt, led to such exhortations as these: 'Remember them which have the rule over you, whose faith follow.' Again, 'Obey them that have the rule over you and submit yourselves, for they watch for your souls as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy and not with grief, for that were unprofitable for you' (Heb. xii. 7, 17). And we read of one who even treated an Apostle's teaching with disrespect. 'I wrote unto the Church,' saith St. John, 'but Diotrephes, who loveth to have the pre-eminence among them, receiveth us not' (3 Epistle 9). Alas! there are too many of the same spirit at the present day.

One more topic before I conclude. I allude to the law under which provision is made for the pastors of the

flock. There is such a law—there has always been such a law—one enacted by the Church's Lawgiver and Head. It is known to all that the Israelites were required to give a tenth, or tithe, of their substance to the Lord, in the person of the Levites and Priests, since they were prohibited from possessing lands. It was, therefore, but an act of justice, that they whose office and work were exclusively for the benefit of others, and who were *therefore* excluded from enjoying property along with those others, should be supported by those for whose best interests they were living and labouring. The principle, that 'the labourer is worthy of his hire,' is one which has the sanction of the God and Father of all men, and on which He established the polity of the Church of old, and which he extended even to the beasts which toil for man, in the command, 'Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox which treadeth out the corn.' A similar principle is laid down in the New Testament. In 1 Cor. ix., St. Paul asserts his right, and if he married, the right of his family also, to 'eat and drink' at the expense of the Church. He asks, 'Who goeth a warfare any time at his own charge? Who planteth a vineyard and eateth not of the fruit thereof? Or who feedeth a flock and eateth not of the milk of the flock?' These were but natural illustrations. He quotes the law of God: 'It is written in the law of Moses, thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn.' He asks: 'Does God take care of oxen?' And he proceeds to show that this was 'written for our sakes,' that the minister of Christ might rest with certainty for his support on the very ordinance of God. He asks a pertinent question, which is in itself an unanswerable argument; 'If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we shall reap you carnal things?' He then refers to the ordinances for the provision of the priests and Levites, and draws the parallelism, 'Even so hath the Lord ordained that they

which preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel.' Here is the ordinance of the Church's Head for the maintenance of the Church's ministers. It removes that maintenance altogether from the region of voluntaryism. It is no more a voluntary act than obedience to any other command of God. To keep from them that which is needful for their support and that of their families is sin, is disobedience to law, a sin equal to the withholding from the Levites of old that which was prescribed for their support, and the withholding which God calls the robbery of Himself (Malachi iii. 8, 9). Let it not be forgotten that the minister is debarred from entering on any other mode of life. He voluntarily resigns those sources of emolument which are open to others, and he does this not for his own benefit, but for the incalculable benefit of others. Is it not, then, a matter of simple justice, as well as being of God's ordering, that those who sow unto others spiritual things should reap their carnal things?

The right to make laws for the Church appertains to the Church itself, which, I need scarcely remark, is not the body of ministers, but ministers and people alike. But while all its members constitute the Legislative Body or Parliament, the ministers are by Christ's appointment its Rulers, to administer its laws. The whole Church is the legislative, the clergymen the executive; as in the State, the Parliament enacts and the magistrates execute the laws.

This is the polity, I may say in passing, of our national Church. The Synod, composed of both clergy and laity, passes its decrees, and the clergy enforce their observance. Neither clergy nor laity can of themselves enact laws. In this respect they separately are powerless. But to the clergy belongs the province to rule, to whom, as such rulers, the laity are in conscience bound to obey within the laws, certainly not beyond them. Neither bishops

nor others are empowered to go beyond the laws and act with autocratic authority. This view of the duty and office of the minister is too frequently at present ignored. He is regarded more as a man to preach than as a pastor to guide. Too prevalent is the idea that in the religion of Christ Jesus every man is as free from the restraint of law as the wild man who roams uncontrolled by such restraints. Hence impatience of the minister's authority, and the independent action which mars the unity of the Church, and in fact challenges the wisdom of God in forming His people into a society, which can exist as such only under the guidance and governance of law. Hence, also, the demand that everything shall be done as each man's fancy or wishes may dictate. Let me say, in summary, the minister's office is not only to feed, but to rule; not to legislate, but to execute the laws of the Church.

All that I have said, with some exception, has reference to the Church as visible among men, and as it shall be until the Great Head of the Church is Himself revealed, when He shall come with the clouds of heaven, come as the Bridegroom when the marriage of the Lamb shall take place. But that Church, here so presented to us as a Bride, is alone the number of those who are truly His by the internal graces of the Holy Spirit, and who have been visible only to the eye of the Heavenly Bridegroom Himself; and that this consummation may shortly be, should be the earnest prayer of every Christian when we look at the state of the Church among us. It is a 'holy Church,' because of its consecration to His service in baptism; because through this it bears His name; but chiefly because of the internal holiness of its real members. Alas! how little external holiness is exhibited generally in correspondence with the internal grace.

And as to unity, visible unity, it is a myth. Spiritual unity between the real members of the body does exist;

it must be; but visible unity, the heart may sigh for it, but it will not be until the day of 'the manifestation of the Sons of God.' Then will Jesus, returning to us, gather His people to share with them His glory as their Head. Then will the Church be visible to all created intelligences, perfect in His comeliness, perfect in holiness, in unity, in glory, 'the General Assembly and Church of the first-born.'

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

PREFACE.

The circumstances which gave rise to the publication of the letters here reprinted from the *Belfast Commercial Chronicle* are the following: A growing dissatisfaction, in the minds of many presbyterians, with the union existing between that body and the national system of education, induced a member to bring the matter before the Belfast Presbytery, with a view to the consideration of the entire question of that system's operations in Ireland. As might have been expected, the ardent admirers of that system opposed the motion; and one minister, in particular, travelled out of his way to make a raid on the Established Church. It appears that many Presbyterian parents prefer the Scriptural Schools of the Church Educational Society to those of the Board. This roused up the anger of the minister referred to, Mr. Robert Knox, of Belfast, who felt that all his influence could not prevent the parents' choice of schools being fully carried out, to his great mortification. The only thing that remained was to blacken the Church and its schools at all hazards, so as, if possible, to frighten parents, and cause them to withdraw their children from the schools. Regardless of all charity, he asserted that Presbyterian children were induced, or tempted, or in danger of being taught the Church Catechism, which inculcated the Popish doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration.

Two anonymous writers replied to Mr. Knox, in the columns of the *Belfast Chronicle;* this ultimately led to the correspondence, as here given, between the Rev. T. Campbell and Mr. Knox. The letters will detail any further particulars required to be known. It is well, however, to add, that no Dissenting child, Protestant or Roman Catholic, attending the schools of the Church Education Society, is taught the Catechism or other formulary of the Church; the Scriptures are taught to all.

The Church Education Society and the Rev. Robert Knox.

To the Editor of the 'Belfast Chronicle.'

Sir,—I have seen two letters in your paper of yesterday, bearing on the Church Education Society and myself. Both letters are *anonymous*, both are without index to any local habitation, and one of them is even without a date; the writers have thus taken every precaution to secure secrecy, so far as they are personally concerned.

I can readily conceive of circumstances in which a high-minded man might discuss a public question through the press without giving his name; but I submit that no man possessed of a moderate share of honourable feeling and moral courage would *reply anonymously to an authenticated letter;* and I believe, Mr. Editor, that, in admitting his reply, you ignore the etiquette by which the respectable portion of the press is regulated.

If a man has a bad cause, or little information, or a disreputable history, or a contemptible *personnel*, he has every motive to work behind a screen; but when the subject is Divine truth, and the writer claims to be a Christian, he reflects discredit both on his theme and his

profession by shrinking from a public testimony. *Truth* has nothing to fear, and the heart that comes under its living influence becomes conscious of power, and, in the face of danger, will glow with true Christian courage.

Holding these sentiments, I abstain from analyzing the letters of your correspondents; but I ask permission to submit two propositions to your readers:

1. I believe, and I am able to prove, that the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration (which is a seminal principle of Popery) is taught in the Church Catechism, in the Book of Common Prayer, and by a large portion of the clergy of the English Church.

2. I deny, and I am able to disprove, that the said doctrine is taught in the Westminster Confession and Catechisms, or in any accredited formulary of the Presbyterian Church.

Controversy is repugnant to my feelings—so much so, that I have usually allowed adverse criticism on myself and my writings to pass away without notice; and if I be now constrained to exhibit the un-Protestant character of any doctrine or symbol of the National Church, it will be to me an uncongenial task.

The public will sympathize with me in adding that, when I do so, it will not be in opposition to anonymous writers, but a candid, honourable, Christian man.—Most faithfully yours,

ROBERT KNOX.

Belfast, *Feb. 17th*, 1855.

The Church Catechism and the Rev. Robert Knox.

To the Editor of the 'Belfast Chronicle.'

Sir,—The Philistine said, 'Give me a man,' and Mr. Knox, in his letter, which appeared in your columns to-day, utters the same cry. It were a pity not to gratify

so valiant a champion. I beg, therefore, thus to intimate to him that I shall be happy to meet him on the points suggested, and now await the promised proofs of his two startling propositions. I require him, however, to define, at the outset, the terms 'Baptismal Regeneration.'

It may be well to say I am not the author of either of the letters to which he refers, nor, except from rumour, do I know who are the writers.—I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

THEO. CAMPBELL.

BELFAST, *Feb. 19th*, 1855.

To the Rev. T. Campbell.

REV. SIR,—I will be glad to confer with you at any time or place that may suit your convenience, for the purpose of fixing on the most suitable medium of communication in discussing the questions between us. If the columns of a newspaper be agreeable to you, I have no objection to offer. It will at once suggest itself to you, as a matter of propriety and equity, that the journal in which the discussion is conducted shall maintain neutral ground; in other words, shall leave the discussion to us, and abstain from editorial comment, which might be kept up as a kind of *cross fire*, to excite prejudice or odium against one of the parties. The *Chronicle*, through whose courtesy I have now the honour of addressing you, promises me '*fair play*,' and yet embodies this promise in an article exceedingly offensive. Besides this, the same number of that paper is opened to an ANONYMOUS writer against me. Such a line of procedure cannot have your sanction, and your friends must regard such subsidiary aid as an insult to your acknowledged ability. It may facilitate our proceedings for me to add that, though the *Chronicle* has already assumed an attitude decidedly hostile to me, I will waive any objection that I might

have on that ground, and address you through its columns—provided a position of neutrality be maintained, and that equal-handed justice be dispensed to you and me. Of course, the above condition refers only to the time over which the discussion may extend.—Most faithfully, etc.,

ROBERT KNOX.

BELFAST, *Feb. 22nd*, 1855.

To the Rev. Robert Knox.

REV. SIR,—In the columns of the *Chronicle* you submitted the two subjoined propositions to the public, which you intimated you were prepared to maintain, provided you could find an opponent. Your motives it is not my province nor my wish to judge. As to the style of your communication, and the character of your propositions, I shall be silent. I will merely remark that, unprovoked yourself, you have provoked the battle; you have selected the ground; you have defined the subjects of dispute—to these, *quoad* the discussion, I have no objection. There is, consequently, no room for the conference you propose.

You submit the propriety of the *Chronicle* abstaining from any comments during the discussion. On this I beg to say that, having no connection whatever with that paper, I can make no promise for it, and must refer you to the proprietors. Except my letter, I have not written nor suggested one line that has appeared on the subject of your attack on the Church, of which I have the high honour to be an unworthy minister. I will pay no attention to aught save the arguments by which you may seek to defend your positions, and shall confine you strictly within the limits you have prescribed.

I have now only to repeat, from my previous letter, that 'I await the promised proofs of your two startling

propositions: and require you, at the outset, to define the terms "Baptismal Regeneration."'—I am, Sir, faithfully yours in Christ,

THEO. CAMPBELL.

BELFAST, *Feb. 23rd*, 1855.

MR. KNOX'S PROPOSITIONS.

'1. I believe, and I am able to prove, that the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration (which is a seminal principle of Popery) is taught in the Church Catechism, in the Book of Common Prayer, and by a large portion of the clergy of the English Church.

'2. I deny, and I am able to disprove, that the said doctrine is taught in the Westminster Confession and Catechisms, or in any accredited formulary of the Presbyterian Church.'

To the Rev. T. Campbell.

REV. SIR,—The Christian public are more concerned about the merits of the doctrine of 'Baptismal Regeneration' than the origin of the present controversy. You appear to attach great importance to the latter point, and I will, therefore, glance at it for a moment. During a late discussion in the Belfast Presbytery, on Education, I expressed regret that Presbyterian children should be taught the Church Catechism, and uttered a sentiment held by every intelligent Presbyterian in the kingdom, namely, that 'Baptismal Regeneration' is taught in the first page of that Catechism. This plain and pregnant truth gave great offence, and an attempt was made, by a portion of the press, to override, in my person, the common heritage of every subject in this free country. Sir, I hold it to be of the very essence of living Protestantism to testify against error. You claim the right of guarding your flock against the full-blown

Popery of Rome, and you cannot dispute my claim to warn my flock against the incipient and sectional Popery of England. You refuse to be gagged, and so do I. If it be essential to 'the Protestant peace' that my lips shall be sealed on all the errors that impregnate the National Church, I will only say that I have never been a party to any such hollow and criminal compact.

For the purpose of putting an end to anonymous attacks on me and on the Presbyterian Church, I submitted two propositions to the public. I had no desire for controversy, but I wanted protection. Every candid member of your Church must have felt humbled by the acrimonious and personal invectives heaped on me by anonymous writers; and now, Sir, that these attacks, as the real moving cause, have launched you and me into a public examination of one of the most vital doctrines of the Christian faith, it rests with us so to prosecute the discussion that it may be overruled for good. I deeply regret that it should take place, not only because strife is uncongenial to me, and, wherever it is possible, my object has been 'to seek the things that make for peace,' but because I fear it will give pain to many Christian people, and may prove a stumbling-block to worldly men, who have neither inclination nor patience to inquire why ministers of the Gospel differ in opinion; and it will undoubtedly be a ground of unhallowed rejoicing to our common enemies.

I trust, however, that the good results will preponderate over all these evils. Our discussion will fix attention on that great spiritual change which every child of Adam must experience before being admitted to the kingdom of glory. It may exhibit to reformers within the National Church the real source of her moral weakness, and urge them to complete the work which their fathers began; and I am not without hope that you and I will be able to show the public that a theological dis-

cussion may be conducted in a fraternal spirit, and that our love of truth has not inspired us with personal dislike.

PROPOSITIONS.

'1. I believe, and I am able to prove, that the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration (which is a seminal principle of Popery) is taught in the Church Catechism, in the Book of Common Prayer, and by a large portion of the clergy of the English Church.

'2. I deny, and I am able to disprove, that the said doctrine is taught in the Westminster Confession and Catechisms, or in any accredited formulary of the Presbyterian Church.'

These propositions are too solemn to be made the subject of the mere artillery of rhetoric; it will be my endeavour to analyze them in a spirit of candour, becoming their importance, and to render them so plain that he who runs may read.

How you can deny that the dogma of 'Baptismal Regeneration' is taught by your Church is a matter of supreme surprise. The evidence against you is distinct and overwhelming. The simple truth is, that this dogma is exhibited by your Church during the whole process through which your people pass, from the cradle to the grave.

When the child is presented at the baptismal font, after the water is sprinkled and the *sign of the cross made*, the *priest* (that is the term of the Prayer-Book) is directed to say, 'Seeing now, dearly beloved, that this child is *regenerate*'—*regenerate*, the strongest term in our language to express a spiritual change of nature! This change is announced to the congregation, not as a matter of *hope*, and *faith*, and *prayer*, but as a *fact* which has taken place *in* and *by* the ordinance. Not only is it announced to the people, but the *priest* is directed to thank God in the

terms following: 'We yield Thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it hath pleased Thee to *regenerate* this infant with Thy Holy Spirit, to receive him for *Thine own child by adoption*,' etc. Let me remind you that this is your Church's public certificate in *every* case.

The officiating priest has no liberty to refuse the ordinance to any child, be the parents what they may—heathens, Jews, or profligates. The 14th Irish canon directs: 'No minister shall refuse or delay to *christen any* child, according to the form of the Book of Common Prayer,' etc. Under a penalty of deprivation of office for three months, you are bound to baptize every child presented, and, when the ceremony is over, to announce its regeneration as a *fact*, to God and men!

Will you explain this, and show anything corresponding to it in the Presbyterian Church? I will take the liberty of suggesting a parallel in a very different quarter.

In the *Rituale Romanum*, the priest, having anointed the child on the crown of the head, in the form of a cross, is directed by the Church of Rome to say: 'Almighty God,' etc., 'who *hath regenerated* thee with water and the Holy Ghost, and who gave to thee remission of all thy sins,' etc.

I leave comment on the forms of the two Churches to you, and I go on to show the light in which you teach the child subsequently to regard the efficacy of his baptism. When the child is able to learn the Catechism, he is asked: 'Who gave you this name?' Mark well the answer: 'My godfathers and godmothers *in* my baptism, *wherein* I was *made* a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of Heaven.'

You, Sir, have expressed some anxiety for a definition of Baptismal Regeneration. I recommend the above very familiar and authorized one as worthy of some notice. If you can suggest a better, I am ready to

consider its merits. I submit to the judgment of every candid mind, that if the compilers of the Catechism were specially anxious to teach Baptismal Regeneration, they could not have selected language better fitted for their purpose. They employ three phrases, each of which distinctly exhibits a *spiritual* work and a *spiritual* privilege. 'A member of Christ.' What does that mean, if not a *spiritual* and personal union with the Saviour of the world? 'The child of God.' What does that mean, if not adoption into His redeemed family, and the possession of at least the germ of His moral image? 'And an inheritor of the kingdom of Heaven.' What does that mean (united as it is to the two preceding phrases), if not translation 'out of the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of God's dear Son.'

Observe, Sir, the child is not led to regard his baptism as a *sign*, or *seal*, or *pledge*, of this threefold spiritual work, but he is taught that *in* his baptism he *was made* 'a member of Christ,' 'the child of God,' etc. He is not taught to examine his heart whether these things be so; the Church teaches him to regard the whole thing as already done. If conscience has been at work, pointing to sin and the law, your Catechism calms his fears, and administers an opiate that may prove awfully pernicious.

Will you find any parallel to this in the accredited teaching of the Presbyterian Church? I will again take the liberty of finding a parallel for you in another quarter. In Butler's Romish Catechism, the child is asked, 'What is Baptism?' Mark the answer: 'A sacrament which cleanses us from original sin, *making* us *Christians*, *children of God*, and *heirs* of the kingdom of Heaven.'

I leave comment on the two Catechisms to you, while I go on to show how your Church expresses her judgment when the youth comes up for 'Confirmation.' During that solemnity, the bishop is directed to pray: 'Almighty and ever-living God, who *hath* vouchsafed to

regenerate these thy servants, by water and the Holy Ghost, and *hath* given unto them remission of *all* their sins,' etc. Here the Church's absolute certificate of a personal regeneration, in the case of *every* individual, is renewed, and that in a most solemn manner, even by an appeal to the Searcher of Hearts.

Sir, I have been struck with one remarkable feature in your liturgical service in the course of my present examination of it, and that is, that I can find *no* prayer for *regeneration*, after baptism has been administered. That spiritual change is assumed throughout. It would appear to be absolutely wrong to ask God to regenerate those who have received baptism. In a catechism published by the late Bishop Mant (who confirmed a large portion of the living Church people of Down and Connor), I find this remarkable passage: 'Persons are said to be regenerate or born again only once.

'Q. And when do you say that is?

'A. When they *are made Christians* at their *baptism*.

'Q. Does the Church teach her members to pray for the grace of regeneration at any other time?

'A. *By no means!*'

I hasten to the closing service, where your Church touches her members for the last time, and expresses her judgment of their final destiny. In the burial service the priest is directed to pray: 'As it has pleased Almighty God, of His *great mercy*, to take *unto Himself* the soul of our *dear brother*, etc., in *sure* and *certain hope* of the resurrection to *eternal life*.'

You are aware, Sir, that this burial service is not intended merely for those who exhibit the life and power of godliness, but for *all*. There are, indeed, three notable exceptions, and what are they? 'Those who die *unbaptized* or *excommunicate*, or who have laid violent hands on themselves.' Just so. BAPTISM is the grand qualification. The deceased may have been infidel, or profligate;

his claim is not thereby vitiated in the mind of the Church. If baptized, he carries to the unseen world her credentials, there to be scorched into their original nothingness by the radiance of Him who sitteth on the Throne, and who hath said, 'Without holiness no man shall see the Lord.'

Sir, this gigantic fallacy of a baptismal salvation, as expressed in the office for the dead, cannot affect the soul whose probation is over. It cannot injure the cold clay. But who can estimate its deadening influence on hundreds that stand round the open grave! That office, which certifies the safety of the soul, may be refused to the most eminent *saint* in this town, who has not received canonical baptism, and must be granted to the most notorious criminal that ever figured in our police calendar.

Before closing this outline of evidence, I desire to fix your attention on the teaching of your Church regarding those who *die in infancy*. If an infant dies *unbaptized*, she refuses to read the burial service over the ashes, and to express *any hope* either of *regeneration* or of a resurrection *to glory*. If an infant dies *after baptism*, what is her judgment? 'It is certain, by the Word of God, that children which are *baptized*, dying before they commit actual sin, are *undoubtedly saved*!' And whence this difference of infinite degree? What is the turning point in the destiny of the young immortal? Baptism. An ordinance administered by a human being decides the eternal condition of an unconscious babe!

I desire your attention now for a brief period to the second proposition. I might fairly have left you to tax your ingenuity in establishing the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration against the Presbyterian Church; but I have spared you this trouble, and I proceed to show every candid mind that there is no ground for the allegation. In the Shorter Catechism a sacrament is defined, 'An holy ordinance, instituted by Christ, wherein, by visible *signs*, Christ and the benefits of the new covenant

are *represented*, *sealed*, and *applied* to BELIEVERS.' It *signifies*, and *seals*, and *applies* to *believers*, and to them only—not to all who receive. Again, *baptism* is defined, 'A sacrament wherein the washing with water in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, does *signify* and *seal* our engrafting into Christ.' I presume you will admit that the *sign* of a thing is not the thing itself, and that a *seal* is not the thing sealed. Again, the same Catechism teaches, 'Baptism is not to be administered to any that are out of the visible Church, *till* they profess their *faith* in Christ and obedience to Him (that is, till they give evidence that they are already Christians—regenerate); but the infants of such as are members of the visible Church are to be baptized.' Your Church must baptize *any* infant, and, having done so, must pronounce it 'regenerate.' Our Church teaches that only infants of *believers* have a right to baptism; and, when the ordinance is administered, she expresses *no* judgment as to the *fact* of regeneration, knowing that God is Sovereign in the application of His grace.

Let me fix your attention on the following statement of the same Catechism; it puts the question beyond the range of doubt or controversy: 'The sacraments become *effectual* means of salvation, not from *any* virtue *in them* or in *him* that doth administer them, but *only* by the blessing of Christ and the working of the Spirit *in them who by faith receive* them,' not in *all*, but in those cases where a living faith operates.

The teaching of the Larger is precisely the same as the Shorter Catechism on baptism, and every other doctrine embraced in it. The same divines drew up both; the only difference being, that the statement of truth is somewhat fuller in the one than in the other. The Larger Catechism defines a sacrament thus: 'An holy ordinance, to *signify*, and *seal*, and *exhibit* unto *those* that are *within the covenant of grace*,' etc. It does not bring them into

the covenant. It does not *make* them children of God, as your Church teaches.

The 'Confession of Faith' bears precisely the same testimony as the Catechism on baptism. It defines sacraments thus: 'Holy *signs* and *seals* of the covenant of grace, and to *represent* Christ and His benefits, and to *confirm* our interest in Him,' etc. Again: 'The grace which is exhibited in or by the sacraments is *not* confirmed by any power in them,' etc.; 'but upon the work of the Spirit, and the word of institution, which contains, together with a precept authorizing the use thereof, a promise of benefit to *worthy* receivers.' Again: 'Baptism is a sacrament,' etc., 'not only for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the *visible* Church, but also to be unto him a *sign* and *seal* of the covenant of grace,' etc. Further: 'Although it be a great sin to contemn or neglect this ordinance, yet grace and salvation are *not so uniformly* annexed unto it as that no person *can be* regenerated or saved without it, or that all that are baptized are *undoubtedly regenerated*.'

One other extract, Sir, and I leave you to deal with the Confession and Catechisms of the Presbyterian Church: 'The *efficacy* of baptism is *not* tied to that moment of time when it is administered; yet, by the *right* use of this ordinance, the grace promised is not only *offered*, but really *exhibited* and *conferred* by the Holy Ghost to *such* (whether of age or infants) as that grace *belongeth unto*, *according to* the council of *God's own will*, in *His* appointed time.'

Comment on this evidence is not at present necessary. I wait with much interest to know how you will make it appear that Baptismal Regeneration is taught in any of these standards. The compilers were not silent on the subject. They were, on the other hand, at special pains to guard against that 'seminal principle of Popery' being supposed, or inferred, or suggested. The most perverse

ingenuity will not be able to wring from them approval of the principle. They did not satisfy themselves with *not* teaching it, they spoke out against it in distinct and substantive condemnation. The contrast between the teaching of your Church and mine is most striking.

Sir, the monstrous delusion of regeneration in and by baptism pervades your entire service. Of this I have produced evidence which no ingenuity will set aside. Of the evil generated by this delusion I dare not speak. The fearful aggregate will be known only at the judgment of the great day. In the beneficent operations of Providence and of sovereign grace, the influence of the formulary is often counteracted by a living ministry, by faithful parents, and by the reflex teaching of other Churches; but when the doctrine is allowed to exercise its natural influence, how tremendous its power to deaden the conscience and deceive the heart!

It is instructive and humiliating to mark the origin and history of the dogma of 'Baptismal Regeneration.' Soon after the days of the Apostles it began to show itself, when superstition gave birth to the idea that some mystic virtue belonged to the functions of the clergy. To encourage this idea has been the grand policy of Rome, and of all who imbibe any measure of her spiritual pride. The theory of the *opus operatum*, so ingeniously contrived to exalt the sacerdotal office, was first started in connection with the initiatory rite, so that *Baptismal Regeneration* lies at the very root and fountain of her apostasy. What a hideous progeny has it brought forth!

Sir, you are well aware that the English Reformation was *a compromise*, and one of the concessions made to Rome was to stereotype this 'seminal principle' of Popery, by assigning it a prominent place in the Catechism and the Book of Common Prayer. It is a well-known historical fact that, in virtue of this compromise, there has ever been in your Church, not only the *matériel* of

Romish doctrine, but a Romanizing party more or less powerful, and that this party have little difficulty in defending their position when they teach the following, among other un-Protestant dogmas: 'That infants are by, and at, baptism unconditionally translated from a state of wrath into a state of grace and acceptance for Christ's sake.'

I shall be astounded, Sir, at your temerity, if you ask me to produce evidence of the fact that there is such a party at present. You are aware that it is so; that they are powerful and well organized; that they are to be found on the episcopal bench, in the professorial chair, in the Houses of Parliament, and among her Majesty's advisers; that they have vast influence in the Universities, and in all the British Colonies; and their strength of numbers and of office is such that their more Protestant opponents are unwilling to encounter them in Convocation, lest the evangelical section be found in a minority.

But it is not these men *alone* who teach 'Baptismal Regeneration.' There are other schools besides the Puseyite in the capacious bosom of your Church, and the great difficulty is to ascertain who among them are better than their ritual. On this point I may be allowed to quote the opinion of one of the ablest opponents of the Tractarian party. Mr. Faber, in his 'Primitive Doctrine of Regeneration,' says: '*I never yet happened to meet with an English clergyman who had either succeeded in persuading himself, or had even attempted to persuade himself, that his Church did not consider the grace of regeneration to be conveyed in baptism.*'

Sir, it has often excited the surprise of Christian men of other denominations that a vigorous and united effort among the good and the true of the National Church has not been made to expurgate those Romish elements to which attention has now been called. With much that is sound and healthy in her Articles, and with her

stupendous resources, there is no limit to the good she might accomplish, if her energies were not entangled and stifled by so many heirlooms of a partial Reformation. You cannot shut your eyes to the fact that the Romish element is rapidly becoming dominant, and that the entire framework of the Establishment is at present quivering towards a crisis. The points brought forward in this letter constitute some of the strongholds of the Tractarians, and so long as you cleave to them and defend them, you will be as impotent as the shorn Samson.—Most faithfully, etc.,

ROBERT KNOX.

BELFAST, *Feb. 27th*, 1855.

To the Rev. Robert Knox.

REV. SIR,—Before I refer to the theological portion of your letter of the 27th ult., it is necessary that I submit to the consideration of the readers of the *News-Letter* my version of the origin of the present controversy.

At a recent meeting of the Belfast Presbytery, a discussion on the subject of National Education having arisen, you diversified the proceedings by a vigorous attack on the National Church, accusing it of teaching 'the seminal doctrine of Popery.'

In the *Chronicle* paper, two anonymous correspondents, each according to his own view of matters, replied to your attack. In the succeeding number of that paper appeared a communication from you, reflecting on these writers, accusing them of want of even 'a moderate share of honourable feeling and moral courage,' and insinuating that they 'had a bad cause, or little information, or a disreputable history, or a contemptible *personnel*;' and that, 'holding these sentiments, you would abstain from analyzing the letters of your (the *Chronicle's*) correspondents.' Being, however, prepared for battle, you submitted your two propositions to the public, as in your letter.

After, at the meeting of the Presbytery *initiating* the controversy, and then in your letter bidding bold defiance to all members of the National Church, you certainly announced, 'controversy is repugnant to my feelings,' adding, however, that 'if I be now constrained to exhibit the un-Protestant character of any doctrine or symbol of the National Church, it will be to me an uncongenial task.' A strong suspicion that someone would take up the gauntlet you so deliberately threw down tempted you to speak, by anticipation, of being 'constrained'; and your anxiety to meet a foe led you to close your letter with what can only be considered in the light of a public challenge to some 'candid, honourable, Christian man,' to appear in his own name, *in propria persona*. It was hardly to be expected that the anonymous writers whom you thus so severely assailed should accept your challenge; but I was free, and wishing to afford you the desired opportunity of advancing the proofs of your first proposition, and disproofs of the second, I addressed the following note to the Editor of the *Chronicle*:

'The Church Catechism and the Rev. Robert Knox.

'Sir,—The Philistine said, "Give me a man," and Mr. Knox, in his letter which appeared in your columns to-day, utters the same cry. It were a pity not to gratify so valiant a champion. I beg, therefore, thus to intimate to him that I shall be happy to meet him on the points suggested, and now await the promised proofs of his two startling propositions. I require him, however, to define, at the outset, the terms "Baptismal Regeneration."

'It may be well to say I am not the author of either of the letters to which he refers, nor, except from rumour, do I know who are the writers.—I am, Sir, yours,' etc.

To this you replied, proposing a conference, 'for the purpose of fixing on the most suitable medium of com-

munication in discussing the questions between us.' You had no objection, you stated, to the columns of the *Chronicle*, 'provided a position of neutrality be maintained, and that equal-handed justice be dispensed to you and me.' In my rejoinder appeared the following passages: 'Unprovoked yourself, you have provoked the battle; you have selected the ground; you have defined the subjects of dispute—to these, *quoad* the discussion, I have no objection; there is, consequently, no room for the conference you propose. You submit the propriety of the *Chronicle* abstaining from any comments during the discussion. On this I beg to say that, having no connection whatever with that paper, I can make no promise for it, and must refer you to the proprietors.' I add: 'I will pay no attention to aught save the arguments by which you may seek to defend your positions, and shall confine you strictly within the limits you have prescribed.'

After the above correspondence, it was but natural that I should have expected some communication from you to appear in the *Chronicle* of Wednesday last. In this I was greatly disappointed, and equally surprised to read, in the *News-Letter* of that day, an announcement that you had transmitted your reply to it for insertion, and that the same should appear in Friday's publication. The public will not be less surprised to learn that this proceeding of yours was without any communication to me, to ascertain if such a change were agreeable to me, or even an intimation that such was your intention. On becoming acquainted with the *News-Letter's* announcement, I inquired of the proprietors of the *Chronicle* if you had applied to them to maintain a position of neutrality during the discussion, in accordance with your proposal, and was informed that no such application had been made by you. Was this the conduct of a man of courtesy and candour? On *Thursday* evening I received by post a note from you, of which the following is a copy:

'REVEREND SIR,—I have addressed a letter to you in the *News-Letter*, and I expect that it will be published to-morrow.—Most faithfully yours,' etc.

No apology, nor even expression of hope that I would not object to the change! What reason was there for such private intimation of a fact publicly announced in the *News-Letter* the day before? Sir, the ground on which a charge is made is the only ground on which it should be repelled. In this case it was of your own selection, and was accepted by me. I have no objection whatever to the columns of the *News-Letter* for our discussion; and, had you failed with the *Chronicle* in your request for neutrality, and acquainted me with your desire to select, in consequence, the *News-Letter* (or, indeed, any other paper), I would at once have consented, and this, too, without any stipulation for neutrality. I make none now with the *News-Letter;* I do not shrink from even adverse criticisms on my productions. But what must I think of an opponent who, sensitive to the last degree, rejects the columns of a paper for his communications unless a pledge to this effect be given, and yet transmits to another his letters for insertion, without affording me an opportunity (if I desired it) to obtain such pledge for my protection? The necessity for making known these particulars to the readers of the *News-Letter* is established by the tendency of your remarks to remove from you—where alone it rests—the guilt of the aggression; for, notwithstanding my unreserved disclaimer of being in any sense the author of the comments which appeared in the *Chronicle*, you write so as to insinuate the impression into the minds of those who may not have seen my letters that I am responsible for them. I deny that these comments are 'the real moving cause' of our discussion. Your conduct is, *parva componere magnis*, analogous to that of the Czar, who, having made an unjustifiable aggression on

Turkey, then assumed the tone of the injured and attacked, and now casts the blame of the war on those who resist his ambitious pretensions.

Now, with regard to your propositions. It is essential to all effective argument that terms be defined. This I called on you to do, and you have not responded to the call. Until you do so, I have no case to grapple with. Pray inform me what you mean by the term *baptismal*. A Presbyterian minister, casting a glance at a Church Catechism, with a sneer exclaimed, 'A few drops of water make a man a Christian!' Thus exhibiting his ignorance both of the ordinance of baptism and of the Church's doctrine. It may be possible that your ideas and his tally; I must therefore ask you what in your view is baptism? Is it 'a few drops of water'? or is it a sacrament? If the latter, say—What is your view of a sacrament? What is essential to a sacrament? What are its constituents? Then define the term '*regeneration*.' Putting these two ideas together, then say—What is the dogma which you designate '*the* doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration'? Are you not aware that very different interpretations of these words are given? So much so, that, as understood by one man, your propositions may be true; and, as understood by another, they may be false. You seem to have some slight conception of this fact, when you quote a passage from the Catechism and say, Here is the doctrine; and then add, 'If you can suggest a better, I am ready to consider its merits.' It is not my province to suggest any interpretation of your expressions, and the request to do so is rather strange—as strange as the quotation of the passage in dispute, to define the doctrine asserted to be found in the passage. A *petitio principii* this of a novel kind! The definition must be found outside that passage, and then laid side by side with it, to test their identity. Having, in the manner suggested, defined these terms, pray proceed a little further in your definitions. What do

you mean by *Popery?* Am I to understand you to assert that every doctrine of the Church of Rome is erroneous? When we have these definitions before us, we shall then have intelligible propositions to discuss.

I cannot but adduce one proof from your letter of the great misapprehension that seems to exist in your mind of both your position and mine in this controversy. You say, 'How you can deny that the dogma of "Baptismal Regeneration" is taught by your Church, is a matter of extreme surprise.' Where did I deny this? I have neither affirmed nor denied anything on the subject; the affirmation and denial are exclusively your own.

You have certainly displayed great ingenuity in stringing together numerous passages out of various formularies; but then you decline to comment on them ('Comment on this evidence is not at present necessary'), or, in other words, to prove your propositions, the interpretation of these passages being the matter of dispute. Why this? Did a shrewd suspicion cross your mind that your comments would overthrow your propositions? With amusing *naïveté* you say, 'I leave comment on the forms of the two Churches to you—I leave comment on the two Catechisms to you.' I beg to assure you we are far from that stage of the discussion when I shall be called on to pass any comments. The character of your wordy epistle is this: You accuse the Established Church of teaching a Popish doctrine in certain passages of its formularies. This doctrine you decline to define; yet you quote these very passages, or one of them, as the definition, and, being challenged to substantiate your view of these passages, you reply by stringing them together and refusing to comment on them, *leaving your opponent to do so* if he pleases. How very considerate this on your part! Why, sir, these passages have been read over and over again—they are well known. What light have you thrown on them? You assert they teach a Popish doctrine; millions assert they

do not. You make no effort to prove their Popery, but leave those millions to discover it if they can—'I leave comment to you.' The extreme confusion that reigns in your mind is evident from this passage in your letter: '. . . have launched you and me into a public examination of one of *the most vital doctrines of the Christian faith*.' Is the Popish doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration *a most vital doctrine of the Christian faith?*

One fact I may advert to before I close this letter. No reference to the Word of God, the only standard of appeal, appears in your epistle, to substantiate the heavy charges of unsound doctrine on the subject of baptism which you bring against the National Church. Of course, you understand that your declamation—'the artillery of rhetoric'—is not even as 'the small dust of the balance' in deciding the truth or falsehood of the Church's doctrines.—Dear Sir, yours faithfully in Christ,

THEO. CAMPBELL.

BELFAST, *March 3rd*, 1855.

To the Rev. T. Campbell.

REV. SIR,—I have read your letter of the 3rd instant, and I must concede to you the honour of having made it difficult for me to frame an answer. That difficulty turns entirely on whether I should notice it at all. You do not attempt to rebut the clear and overwhelming evidence by which I have proved that the doctrine of your Church on the vital point of *regeneration* has been—I will not say sprinkled by, but saturated—literally steeped in—the residuum of Rome. I have neither time nor inclination, Sir, for quibbling, and I have a natural abhorrence of anything like evasion, especially in dealing with sacred things. I have too much respect for the moral perception and sound sense of the Christian public to expect or desire that they will be either interested or edified by *puerilities*.

Without recurring at present to the originating cause of this controversy, I may say that I entered into it with you in good faith, and in the charitable conviction that you were what you assumed to be, 'a candid, honourable Christian man.' You came forward spontaneously, and of your own free motion, and accepted the propositions, making one condition—that I should define '*Baptismal Regeneration*.' Without acknowledging your right to make any such condition, I gratified you so far as to suggest a definition with this threefold commendation—that it is ancient, familiar, and canonical—and I even tendered an exposition of its terms. You are not satisfied with this, and you now demand *eight* new definitions; and unless you get them, 'you have nothing to grapple with'! In other words, you will not, and cannot, discuss the subject. You ask me, 'What is *baptismal?*' 'What is *baptism?*' 'What is a *sacrament?*' 'What is *essential* to a *sacrament?*' 'What are its constituents?' 'Define the term *regeneration*.' (!) 'What is the dogma which you term the doctrine of *Baptismal Regeneration?*' (!) 'What do you mean by POPERY?' (!)

Sir, you and I might keep up a tilting match on these terms till next Christmas; would you even then be ready, in the spirit of 'a candid, honourable, Christian man,' to grapple with my propositions? Let us hear you on this point: '*I have neither affirmed nor denied anything on the subject of Baptismal Regeneration!*' Just so; you hold yourself open to take any side you please—to announce any opinion that may be most convenient! What, then, did you mean by saying, in your first letter, 'I shall be happy *to meet him* on the points suggested, and now await the promised proofs of his two startling propositions'? As a palladium from the cowardly assaults of anonymous writers, I placed before the public this proposition: 'I believe, and I am able to prove, that the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration (which is a seminal principle of

Popery) is taught in the Church Catechism, in the Book of Common Prayer, and by a large portion of the clergy of the English Church.'

You volunteered your able services as the champion of that Church, and said, 'I shall be happy *to meet him* on the points suggested'; that is, you take the *negative* of the proposition, and stand ready to rebut my proofs. If you don't mean this, you trifle with me and the public, and bring your Church into a fantastical position. I denied that the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration is taught by the Presbyterian Church, and you say, 'I will be happy to meet him on the points suggested.' That is, you affirm the proposition, and stand prepared to combat my evidence. If you don't mean this, you trifle with me and the public. In a subsequent letter you appear peculiarly explicit, for you address me thus: 'You have selected the ground; you *have defined* the subjects of dispute. To these, *quoad* the discussion, I have no objection.' When you wrote this you were glowing under the inspiration of valour yet untried; you were carried away by the genial influence of that self-adulation which prompted you to announce yourself the moment you heard that 'a candid, honourable, Christian man' was wanted. New light has broken in on you. You have had a little time to examine your position, and you have come into contact with that Truth which is invincible and all-conquering: and you now imagine that, under the shelter of *eight definitions*, you have secured a retreat.

Sir, nothing short of a strong moral necessity could induce me to engage in controversy, and when I did take up my pen, it was on a grave, vital question. Those who have read my letter will not be surprised that, in my proper place as a member of Presbytery in one of the courts of our Church, I warned my brethren against giving over the children of our flocks to be taught the dogma of Baptismal Regeneration, which generated the Papacy,

and which is rapidly Romanizing the National Church. I had an indefeasible right, as a watchman, to utter that warning; and I cannot be deterred from repeating it, till it sink into the memory and conscience of the public, even though I be covered with abuse by a portion of the Episcopal press.

Sir, your letter expounds the true philosophy of your Church's weakness and threatened dissolution. Instead of beginning in right earnest, as valiant Christian men, to extract 'the root of bitterness,' you and others set yourselves to deny, and defend, and quibble, and sophisticate, as if the days of the schoolmen were revived, and as if you could receive protection or deliverance from the wretched policy of Ignatius Loyola.

ROBERT KNOX.

BELFAST, *March 6th*, 1855.

To the Rev. Robert Knox.

REV. SIR,—The annals of controversy can scarcely furnish another example of a disputant submitting a proposition for discussion and refusing to acknowledge the right of his opponent to require a definition of the terms he employs; and not only refusing this acknowledgment, but actually declining the explanation when demanded. It is apparent that there is in your imagination a floating, dreamy, misty something which you are unable to reduce to accuracy, or that you perceive a definition of the terms would be fatal to your propositions. If you have entered on this controversy in the 'good faith' you proclaim, why do you shrink from fully exhibiting your charge against the Church, and from making it impossible we should differ as to its meaning? Why not give the fullest explanation that is possible? Why hide yourself behind words capable of different interpretations, and that are actually so employed?

Nature abhors a vacuum, and no less does the Rev. Robert Knox abhor a definition; he shrinks from the demand of an explanation as from the point of a spear.

It is an old and true proverb, 'You may as well hang a dog as give him a bad name.' If not very elegant, it is very expressive—fully so of your conduct in raising the cry of Popery against the Church, and, when pressed home for an explanation, refusing to give it. Such, when given, would at once exculpate the accused; but this would not suit your purpose.

You object to being asked for so many definitions as my last letter solicited. These only show how thoroughly a man should understand the subject before he ventures to enlighten others, and were suggested by me as a help to you in giving a full, clear, and accurate definition, about which hereafter there could be no cavil. But you are evidently not prepared for such accuracy. You are much astonished at my asking what you mean by Popery? omitting, however—of course by accident—an explanatory question, '*Am I to understand you to assert that every doctrine of the Church of Rome is erroneous?*' You will not certainly say so; and hence your charge of Popery is vague and indefinite, calculated to excite prejudice, and prevent a calm investigation of the subject. It is easy to use an odious word. Those who recklessly fling around them the firebrands of accusation are satisfied, no matter how indefinite the charge, if only some floating idea of disparagement be suggested by the word to the minds of the unthinking and the prejudiced; and such accusers always abhor definitions. You have acted on this principle in the enunciation of your first proposition. It divides itself into two parts, as follows:

1. That this doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration is taught in the Church Catechism, etc.

2. That the doctrine is a seminal principle of Popery.

It is evident that the sting here is the word *Popery*. It

is not because a doctrine is taught in the Church Catechism that it is of necessity false. It did, then, become me to inquire what you meant by the doctrine, and what you meant by Popery; and it was, and is, incumbent on you to explain, and to establish your charge as so explained. But you will do neither: *the word* Popery is enough for your purpose.

The necessity for explanation is increased by the fact that some of the ministers of your Church totally dissent from you in your interpretation of these words. Thus Dr. Cooke expressed himself at the last meeting of the General Assembly, held in this town:

'With regard to some of the differences that appeared in the Liturgy and in the celebration of the ordinances he could not agree, but with regard to Baptismal Regeneration that Church held doctrines identical with their own. . . . He did not hesitate to affirm that, if anyone would be at the pains to read the history of the changes that had taken place in that service-book, he would be compelled to come to the conclusion that doctrine conformable to their own was the real doctrine of the Church of England. (Cries of 'No, no.') Did those who say "No" study the question? There was not a man who cried "No" had studied the subject more fully than himself.'—*Chronicle*, July 13th, 1854.

Will you charge Dr. Cooke with holding the 'seminal principle of Popery,' and all the other abominations you have connected with the doctrine? It is evident that he and you differ widely in your interpretations, respectively, of the terms.

Sir, you inform me that 'you gratified me so far as to suggest' (is this word to be understood in its strict meaning?) 'a definition with this threefold commendation, that it is ancient, familiar, and canonical,' and you 'even tendered an exposition of its terms.' You refer to the words, 'wherein I was made a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of Heaven.' Although, as a definition, this cannot be shown to be either ancient or canonical—and, if familiar, is only so

with those who have not studied the subject—yet am I willing to regard it as your definition, if you say it is ; the words above quoted from your letter do not positively and explicitly declare so. Will you abide by this definition, 'The doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration (as in my propositions) is that, in the sacrament of Baptism, the baptized person is made a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of Heaven'? And will you add, '*There is nothing more included in my view of the doctrine*'? 'I will understand the *sacrament* of Baptism as it is defined in the Catechism and Articles of the Church, and not as "a few drops of water"'? If you will abide by this, I will at once admit that such a doctrine is taught in the Prayer-Book of the Irish Church, and call on you to prove that said doctrine to be 'a seminal principle of Popery.' But here you must be explicit. It is no argument against the truth of a doctrine that it is held by the Church of Rome. I will substitute the word *Trinity* for *Baptismal Regeneration* in your propositions, and thus exhibit this more fully :

1. I believe, and I am able to prove, that the doctrine of the Trinity (which is a doctrine of the Church of Rome) is taught in the Church Catechism, etc.

2. I deny, and I am able to disprove, that the said doctrine is taught by the Westminster Confession, etc.

You see, Sir, you have gained nothing when you have proved that a doctrine is held by the Church of Rome; you must go further, and prove it contrary to Scripture, before you are justified in accusing a Church on account of it. You must not misunderstand me. I do not say that the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, as above defined, or suggested to be defined, is a doctrine of the Church of Rome. You are to prove this, if you can ; and that it is one of the doctrines of that Church which are contrary to Scripture.

I can scarcely persuade myself you are serious when

you speak of the 'clear and overwhelming evidence' you advanced in support of your propositions—propositions which you did not understand when you penned them, and are even now unable to define. You strung together a number of quotations, and honestly announced your intention not to comment on them, these being the passages in dispute, in which, so far as they belong to the Church, you assert there is false doctrine, and I assert there is not. What evidence did you advance to prove that they teach falsehood? NONE; you announced that you would advance none, but leave all to me; and yet you talk of your overwhelming evidence!

Sir, God says in the Proverbs (xx. 6): 'Most men will proclaim every one his own goodness; but a faithful man who can find?' You are no exception to this rule. You have trumpeted forth your praises with no uncertain sound. But, notwithstanding the high eulogiums you have passed upon yourself—eulogiums that strangely contrast with your proceedings—I will take the liberty to remind you, as in my last letter, that 'of course you are aware your declamation is not even "as the small dust of the balance" in deciding the truth or falsehood of the Church's doctrines.' I now understand your saying, 'controversy is repugnant to my feelings.' To bring accusations against the Church is quite to your taste; but to explain your charges, and to prove them—this is 'repugnant to your feelings.' I believe you.

Permit me to commend to your attention the injunction of the Scriptures: 'Let another man praise thee, and not thine own mouth; a stranger, and not thine own lips' (Prov. xxvii. 2).—I am, Sir, faithfully yours in Christ,

THEO. CAMPBELL.

BELFAST, *March 8th*, 1855.

To the Rev. T. Campbell.

REV. SIR,—You have never attempted to assail one of my arguments, nor even to look my evidence in the face. This has not excited much surprise.

It is very different, however, with the position you have taken up—'*I have neither affirmed nor denied anything on the subject' of discussion!* By accepting my propositions you were pledged *to deny the first, and to affirm the second.* On no other terms could you be recognised as a public disputant. Had you announced your convenient neutrality at the outset, your proposal to discuss the subject would have been scouted.

Sir, I am not insensible to the difficulty of your position, with the teaching of your Church on the one side, and the sentiment of the right-hearted of your people on the other. It is for you to consider what testimony you shall bear within your own circle on a subject that is not unlikely to rend your body; but, when you enter the arena of discussion, you cannot be allowed to occupy an equivocal position.

I have only to add that, until you distinctly state that you are prepared to deny my first proposition and to affirm the second, and until you make some attempt at an answer to my letter of February 27, I must regard you as having no claim whatever on my notice.—Most faithfully, etc.,

ROBERT KNOX.

BELFAST, *March 10th*, 1855.

To the Rev. Robert Knox.

REV. SIR,—I should be sorry to triumph over a fallen foe. I cannot, however, but deeply grieve on your account. In the stale language of unreasoning bigotry you indited two propositions—the only intelligible point

in which was your desire to cast dirt at the Church. I offered to discuss these propositions with you, ON CONDITION that you would so define your terms as to render them intelligible. This you positively refused to do. Until this were done, no wise man would venture either to affirm or deny aught concerning them. To advance evidence in support of propositions you did not yourself understand, was an impossibility. One solitary argument you did not venture to adduce; and yet you have the temerity, even in your last letter, to speak of your arguments! The falsity of the Church's doctrines can be established only by the Word of God, and to this you did not once refer.

Prior to my first letter, I had neither affirmed nor denied anything on the subject of the discussion, because I was expecting your explanation; but, in my last, I both affirmed and denied much, because you had '*suggested*' a definition. I accepted that definition, if you would not *suggest*, but declare, in all good faith, it was that which was included in your propositions. On this understanding I *affirmed* that such doctrine is taught in our Catechism and Book of Common Prayer; and I *denied* that any unsound doctrine exists in any of the various quotations so skilfully strung together in your letter of the 27th ult.; and I called on you to take the Word of God, and prove therefrom, if you could, the false teaching of the Church in these passages. 'Tis here, Sir, that I grieve for you. It is too evident that, in *suggesting* the definition, you intended to mislead both the public and me, such not being your definition of the doctrine, for when accepted by me you slunk away from the discussion, perceiving at a glance that you could not maintain your position. I directed you to the Bible; but no, to the Bible you would not go. Surely the public will not be slow to mark this significant fact—an Episcopalian boldly appealing to the Word of Truth in defence of the de-

spised and maligned Book of Common Prayer, and a Presbyterian enemy of that book running away from the Bible as the only standard of appeal.

You speak of divisions in the Church. Is this wise, knowing as you do, and as I showed in my last letter, that such men as Dr. Cooke, and others whom I could name, hold that the doctrine of our Church and theirs is identical? If, then, my Church teaches falsehood, so do these men; but I apprehend that their opinions will outweigh the aspersions which flippant ignorance delights to hurl at the National Church.

Sir, you have exercised sound discretion in closing our correspondence, and, in compliance with your wishes, it shall be closed. I will, however, God willing, in my own way bring before the intelligent public the doctrine of the Church on the subject of baptism, and establish its truth by the testimony of Holy Scripture; and, if opportunity should offer, I will not overlook the *fallacies* with which your lengthy letter abounds.—I am, Sir, faithfully yours in Christ,

THEO. CAMPBELL.

BELFAST, *March 12th*, 1855.

To the Editor of the 'Belfast Chronicle.'

SIR,—It is the object of the ambition of every tyro in the Dissenting ministry to break a lance with the Church. The chosen ground is its supposed Popery. A favourite cry is, 'The English Reformation (and I suppose the Irish, too) was a compromise'—a statement, by the way, ridiculously untrue; and one of the chief points of attack is its teaching on the subject of baptism. We are told that here it inculcates 'a seminal principle of Popery.' We challenge the assailant to make good his charge by laying down, in the first place, the Church's doctrine; and, in the second, by proving by the Word of God the asserted falsity thereof.

Dishonesty and ignorance on the part of the accuser now appear. The document in which the Church's views of doctrine on all subjects are contained is overlooked, never referred to, and its very existence ignored; I allude, of course, to 'the Articles.' I ask, is this honest? Is it not a confession that the charge of Popery cannot be sustained? The Bible fares equally with the Articles—no appeal is ever made to its sacred pages to decide the case. Is not this a silent acknowledgment that the Church's doctrine is according to Scripture? Yet the attacks proceed; the charges are repeated, to be again and again repelled by the simple demand of Scripture proofs, which have not been, and cannot be, adduced.

The course of proceeding is to settle on an expression —a word in the services of the Church, and hold it up in anticipated triumph. Sometimes the various passages in which the expression occurs are skilfully strung together and thus left, it is hoped, to tell the tale of the accuser, who hereby displays his own ignorance of their import, or imposes on the presumed ignorance of the readers. A controversialist who acts in honest fairness would say: 'The doctrine, as laid down in the Articles, is correct; but, in my judgment, a word is used in the services which is, in its application, contradictory of the Articles, though I am persuaded that, as the men who drew up the Articles were the men who composed or compiled the services, there can really be no contradiction, and they must have affixed to the term a meaning different from that which it appears to me to bear; and I will not "make a man (much less a Church) an offender for a word."'

Sir, the Lord severely rebukes those 'who make a man an offender for a word' (Isaiah xxix. 21). He classes them with those 'that watch for iniquity'; and yet such conduct is unhesitatingly pursued towards the Church of the land, by men who arrogate to themselves the sum total of piety. Were I to act in this manner, what a

fearful charge could I bring against the Church of Scotland and all sister Churches! The Westminster Confession of Faith and the two Catechisms are their doctrinal documents, according to which they are to be tested. These documents thus express themselves on the subject of baptism: 'Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, not only for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the visible Church, but also to be unto him a sign and SEAL of the covenant of grace, of his ingrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins, and of his giving up to God through Jesus Christ, to walk in newness of life' (Confession, p. 96). These, then, constitute 'the grace of baptism' according to the Presbyterian Church, and are not only signed, but *sealed*—that is *secured*—by baptism; the *securing*, *conferring*, or *applying* of which grace is called 'the efficacy of baptism'; on which point the Confession further teaches thus: 'The efficacy of baptism is not tied to that moment of time wherein it is administered. Yet, notwithstanding, BY the right use of that ordinance, the grace promised is *not only offered*, but REALLY *exhibited* and CONFERRED by the Holy Ghost to such (whether of age or infants) as that grace belongeth unto,' etc.; that is, *the elect*. The doctrine of the Presbyterian Church, then, is, that all the blessings above enumerated—*regeneration* among them—are *really conferred* BY the right use of baptism, by the Holy Ghost, on the elect. In other words, *the Baptismal Regeneration of the elect*, adults or infants, is the doctrine of the Presbyterian Church. The Larger Catechism, among other similar statements, thus defines baptism, in respect to its difference from the Lord's Supper: 'Baptism is to be administered but once with water, to be a sign and *seal* of our regeneration and ingrafting into Christ, and that even to infants.' The Shorter Catechism defines 'Sacraments to be holy ordinances; wherein, by sensible signs, Christ and the

benefits of the new covenant are represented, *sealed* and APPLIED to believers.'

Such is the doctrine of the Presbyterian Church. But, if I were to quote from a document not a doctrinal one, nor so accredited as the above, and to bring a charge of heresy on the wording of that document, I should be guilty of the sin rebuked by the prophet. I refer to the paraphrase on Romans vi., which runs thus:

> 'When to the sacred font we came,
> Did not the rite proclaim
> That, washed from sin and all its stains,
> New creatures we became?'

What is this? Sin and *all its stains* washed away! the stain of *original* as well as actual sin gone from the baptized, and at the sacred font! This is Popery, indeed. And, besides, '*new creatures* we became!' No word more fully represents the spiritual change which passes over the believer than that of 'new creature.' The Scriptures say, 'If any man be in Christ, he is a *new creature;* old things are passed away;' and 'in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a *new creature*.' And this great spiritual change—this new birth in the soul, is averred, by all who sing this paraphrase, to have taken place in them at the sacred font at baptism.

Now, Sir, I do not charge the Presbyterian Church with the falsehood taught by this paraphrase, but the charge justly lies against the framers and approvers thereof, if they understood the meaning of the language they employed; and against all who sing the same, if they likewise know what they affirm. The most rabid Puseyite could not express himself in more outrageous terms. It is deeply to be deplored that such a statement should be bound up with, and circulated along with, the Bible, as it is, alas! in too many instances.

As the doctrines held by any body of men are to be deduced from its avowedly doctrinal documents, so also is that of the Established Church. The Articles accordingly thus speak: 'Sacraments, ordained of Christ, be not only badges or tokens of *Christian* men's professions, but rather they be certain sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace and God's goodwill towards us, by the which He doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in Him' (Acts xxv.). 'Baptism is not only a sign of profession and mark of difference whereby *Christian* men are discerned from others that be not christened, but it is also a sign of regeneration or new birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that *receive baptism* RIGHTLY are grafted into the Church; the *promises* of forgiveness of sins, and of our adoption to be the sons of God BY the Holy Ghost are *visibly* signed and sealed; faith is confirmed, and grace increased by virtue of prayer unto God' (Acts xxvii). This is the doctrine of the Church, and, when compared with the above quotations from the Presbyterian documents, will be seen to be of a character that, if anything, places the sacraments in a lower position in the economy of grace than does the doctrine of the Presbyterian Church. In this, baptism is regarded as *really* sealing and conferring, or applying grace, such as 'ingrafting into Christ, regeneration, remission of sins;' while, according to the Article of the Church, it only '*visibly* signs and seals *the promises*' of these things.

In a subsequent communication I propose to consider the expressions objected to in the baptismal and other services, and the Catechism, with a view of ascertaining if they be contradictory of the doctrine of the Church.—I am, faithfully yours,

THEO. CAMPBELL.

BELFAST, *April* 10*th*, 1855.

To the Editor of the 'Belfast Chronicle.'

SIR,—In my preceding letter I established from the doctrinal document of the Church its views of baptism. It may be well to recapitulate them. Baptism, as a sacrament, is—

1st. A sign of profession and mark of difference whereby *Christians* are discerned from those who are not christened.

2nd. It is a sign of regeneration, by which, as by an instrument, those who receive baptism rightly (and no others) are grafted into the Church—that is, the visible Church.

3rd. It is a *visible* sign and seal of the *promises* of forgiveness of sins, and of our adoption to be sons of God *by the Holy Ghost.*

4th. By virtue of the prayer offered, faith is confirmed and grace increased, implying that both the faith and the grace were *previously possessed* by the party baptized.

I may here add this further utterance of the Church, taken from Article XXVI.: 'The effect of Christ's ordinance is not taken away by their (the ministers') wickedness, nor the grace of God's gifts diminished from SUCH AS BY FAITH AND RIGHTLY DO RECEIVE THE SACRAMENTS ministered unto them, which be effectual, BECAUSE OF CHRIST'S INSTITUTION AND PROMISE.'

It is established by this quotation that the Church holds:

1st. That the grace of God's gifts in the sacraments attends such parties only as *by faith and rightly* do receive the sacraments.

2nd. That sacraments derive all their efficacy from *Christ's institution and promise.*

Again: Article XXV. avers, in accordance with the above that '*in such only* as *worthily* receive the same

(the sacraments) they have a wholesome effect or operation.'

Once more—Article XXIX.: 'The wicked, and *such as be void of a lively faith*, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper) the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, yet *in no wise are they partakers of Christ.*'

Thus by utterance after utterance does the Church of this land repudiate the Roman doctrine of the *opus operatum*, which places the efficacy of the sacraments in the mere reception of them, or in the *work done* even by the priest alone, as, for instance, the putting the wafer into the mouth of a dying man, in a state of insensibility, or anointing him with oil when in a similar condition. And yet men are not ashamed to charge the Church with this doctrine? some boldly enough; others by insinuation, as if aware they could not substantiate the charge. Do these men not know that for every such idle word they shall give account in the day of judgment?

'But the Church pronounces every baptized person regenerate.' Does it do so in the sense in which the objector employs the term regenerate? *Most decidedly not.* No two things can be more different than the ideas respectively connected with the word in the minds of the opposing parties. The Church understands by it a change of state; the objector, a change of character; the former, relative; the latter, personal—a relative change of state; a personal change of character.

The term *regeneration* was employed, both by heathens and Jews, to denote a change from an outward condition of adversity to one of prosperity, from evil to good; as, for instance, the return of an exile to his home and former happy state. Josephus uses the word when describing the restoration of the Jews from their captivity in Babylon to their land. Cicero similarly designates his own recall from banishment, and the

Rabbins likewise speak of the altered state of proselytes as their regeneration.

The Scripture use of the word is similar. It occurs but twice in the Bible—once, employed by our Lord in reference to the future changed and restored condition of the earth. Addressing the disciples, He says, 'Ye who have followed Me, *in the regeneration* when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of His glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel' (Matt. xix. 28); the event to which he refers being the same as in Acts iii. 19, 21, where it is called 'the restitution of all things.' This is the time when the Lord will return to earth in His glory, set up the throne of His glory upon it; when the curse under which it is now groaning shall be removed (Rom. viii. 18-23), and its restoration to its pristine state be accomplished; then will be the RE-GENERATION.

Nor is this use of the word uncommon among us. When expressing our hope of an altered condition of our land from present degradation to exaltation, from want and misery to comparative plenty and happiness, we speak of 'the regeneration of our country;' and we do so correctly.

It is not difficult to conceive how natural was the application of the word to a change so decided as marked the profession of the Gospel in the Apostles' days, whether men turned from Jewish fables, or heathen idols, to serve the living God. And, further, its connection with the rite of baptism, whereby men did make their open profession of this change, and passed into the number of the Christians; whereby they were admitted into the visible Church, and to all the privileges of the people of God. Thus St. Paul writes to Titus: 'According to His mercy He saved us by *the washing of regeneration*, and renewing of the Holy Ghost' (iii. 5). (This text, as also Eph. v. 26, is referred to baptism in the notes to the Westminster Confession.) 'The washing,' the bath;

theologically speaking, *the laver* in which parties were baptized. Thus the expression 'Baptismal Regeneration' may be considered Scriptural. But, between this and the internal work of the Holy Ghost in the heart, the distinction is marked: 'the washing of regeneration' being one thing, and 'the renewing of the Holy Ghost' another; the one being *external*, and the other *internal*; the one symbolizing the washing away of sin; the other being the birth of new spiritual life in the soul; the one being a *visible* act of profession of faith in the blood of Christ, for remission of sins; the other the actual operation of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus, communicated to the soul; the one declaring by a symbol a change of state from guilt and condemnation to justification and salvation; the other effecting a change of character—a moral and spiritual change from 'darkness to light,' from spiritual death to spiritual life, from the love of sin to the love of holiness.

This latter change is improperly designated regeneration by the second class of theologians to whom I have referred, and who are our opponents; such an application of the term not being warranted by classical, Scriptural, or ecclesiastical usage. Nor is it the idea connected in the baptismal service of the Church with the expression. If we, then, be charged with pronouncing every baptized person *regenerate* in this latter sense, *of a moral or spiritual internal change of character*, we deny the charge; if in the former, of a *relative external change of state*, we admit it, and maintain that, both from Scripture and the nature of the thing itself, we are warranted in so pronouncing.

I must defer the continuation of the subject and examination of the services to a future opportunity, not wishing to trespass at too great a length at present on the patience of your readers.—I am, Sir, faithfully yours,

THEO. CAMPBELL.

BELFAST, *April 14th*, 1855.

To the Editor of the 'Belfast Chronicle.'

SIR,—According to the doctrine of the Established Church, 'Baptism is a sign (or symbol) of regeneration.' It is not regeneration. Regeneration is a change of state, from evil to good. 'Spiritual regeneration' is a change from a state of guilt and condemnation to a state of justification and salvation. Of this it is that baptism, which is a visible act, is a symbol. Washing away the filth of the flesh by water is a fitting symbol of washing away the guilt of the soul by the blood of Christ. This is the great doctrine of Christ, and he who believes it and thus in heart becomes His disciple, is required by Christ to testify the same unto, and before, men, by a symbol thereof, even baptism, which is *a speaking act*. Thus he becomes, openly, before men, a disciple by baptism, having been such previously, but *secretly, before God*. This profession of discipleship by baptism is designated by our Lord the *being born of water*: 'Except a man be born of water' (John iii. 5). The man so born of water is regenerate of water.

This change of state, thus designated, and also called 'remission of sins,' is the grace more immediately connected with baptism in the baptismal services. But, first, in the Nicene Creed we profess our faith in 'one baptism for the remission of sins.' The first prayer instances the case of Noah and his family in the ark being saved by water (from the state of condemnation in which the world was), which was a type of baptism (1 Peter iii. 20, 21). And also the case of the Israelites, who were baptized (from the guilt and condemnation of the Egyptians) in the Red Sea (1 Cor. x. 2). The prayer then adds: 'And, by the baptism of Thy well beloved Son Jesus Christ in the river Jordan, didst sanctify water *to the mystical washing away of sin*.' The following prayer contains a petition to the same effect, thus: 'We call

upon Thee, for this infant, that he, coming to Thy holy baptism, may receive *remission of his sins by* SPIRITUAL REGENERATION.' The prayer immediately before the act of baptizing, after reciting the command and commission of the Lord to His disciples, to go teach all nations, 'baptizing them in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost,' adds, 'sanctify this water to the *mystical washing away of sin*.' Here is plainly declared the grace of baptism, as in the service; and it is to this the word 'regenerate' points in the subsequent pronouncement by the minister. It may be well here to remind your readers that the word *priest* in the rubric is the same as *presbyter*, being a corruption of that word; or, perhaps, borrowed from the French *prêtre*, and that it does not mean 'one who offers sacrifice,' as among heathens and Roman Catholics. The two Greek words which represent the two different officers are *Hiereus* and *Presbuteros*. The English language does not contain a word that fitly represents the former (*Hierist* would do, but it is unknown to us); and hence, unfortunately, the one word *priest* is used for both—for a *sacrificing officer*, and for a *presbyter* or *elder*, or *minister*.

Passing from the Prayer-Book to the Scriptures, we shall find that, although consequent upon baptism is the gift of the Holy Spirit, yet the grace immediately connected with baptism is the remission of sins. In Acts ii. 38, the inquiring Jews are thus directed by St. Peter: 'Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, *for the remission of sins*, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.' Similarly does Ananias address Saul: 'Arise and be baptized, *and wash away thy sins*' (Acts xxii. 16). These are remarkable passages—none more so. If they occurred in any document of the Church, in their pure Scriptural form, I believe the Church's enemies would hurl the charge of Popery or Puseyism at it. Taken alone, they assert *the*

actual and absolute washing away of sin in, and by, baptism; while, as used by the Church, they have a comment attached in the word 'mystical,' as we see in the extracts from the service.

Thus, in Scripture, baptism (which is a symbol of regeneration) proclaims a change from a state of guilt and condemnation to a state of justification and salvation.

This seems to be the place to put prominently forward a principle in relation to sacraments which is of the utmost importance, and which I cannot state in better words than the Westminster Confession of Faith furnishes: 'There is in every sacrament a *spiritual relation*, or *sacramental union*, between the sign and the thing signified; whence it comes to pass that the *names* and EFFECTS *of the one are attributed to the other*' (Chap. xxvii.). That is, *the names* and EFFECTS *of the thing signified are attributed to the sign;* so that what is true only of the inward grace is, nevertheless, attributed to the sign AS ITS EFFECT. The notes to the Confession refer to the following passages in proof of the soundness of this principle, viz., Gen xvii. 10, where circumcision is called the covenant; whereas it is only the sign and seal thereof, Matt. xxvi. 27, 28, where the cup (or wine) is called the blood, of which it is only the symbol, Titus iii. 5; where occurs the phrase, 'the washing (or bath) of regeneration;' that is, baptism is called, or *the effect* of it is said to be, regeneration. Thus, applying this principle, what are truly *the effects* of regeneration alone are attributed to baptism and *its effects.*

Bearing this in mind, we shall now consider another grace connected with baptism, as following close upon it. St. Peter declares, in the words before quoted, 'Be baptized for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.' The internal operation of the Holy Spirit in the heart, which is called by our Lord

the being 'born of the spirit,' and by St. Paul 'the renewing of the Holy Ghost,' is then, with all its effects, the other grace connected with baptism, so that this too may be attributed to baptism as ITS EFFECT. Therefore, as regards 'the name,' baptism is new birth; and, as regards 'the effects,' baptism produces the internal renewing of the heart and all its consequences; all this, however, be it never forgotten, solely because of 'the spiritual relation or sacramental union (as the Confession expresses it) that is in every sacrament. Whence it comes to pass that the name and effects of the one (new spiritual birth) ARE ATTRIBUTED to the other' (baptism); and, be it remembered, so attributed by the Holy Ghost in the Scriptures.

I shall establish this principle still further by Scripture: 'Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into His death, *therefore we are buried with Him* BY *baptism into death*, that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life' (Rom. vi. 3, 4).

On this passage is grounded the following, from the exhortation in the baptismal service: 'Remembering always that baptism doth *represent* unto us our profession, which is to follow the example of our Saviour Christ, and to be made like unto Him; that as He died and rose again for us, so should we, who are baptized, die to sin and rise again unto righteousness; continually mortifying all our evil and corrupt affections, and daily proceeding in all virtue and godliness of living.' Thus while the Scriptures declare that 'we are buried with Christ BY baptism,' the Church, as to this point, only speaks of baptism as REPRESENTING *unto us our profession.*

Another text, confirmatory of the soundness of the principle in the confession, is Gal. iii. 26, 27: 'Ye are all *the children of God* by faith in Christ Jesus; FOR as many of you as have been baptized into Christ *have put on Christ.*' The character of the Galatians, as Christians,

was of the lowest order 'removed from the Gospel of Christ—not obeying the truth.' To such the Apostle says, 'Ye are *all* the children of God by faith in Jesus Christ,' and he connects this standing of children with their baptism: 'For as many of you as were *baptized into Christ* HAVE PUT ON CHRIST;' here referring to an Eastern custom of adoption by putting on a garment, by which the party was adopted into the family, *made a child of the family;* and baptism is here described as the act of putting on Christ, whereby we are made the children of God. Thus, keeping by our principle, *the effects* of the thing signified are attributed to the sign; and, therefore, these backsliding Galatians, of whom the Apostle stood in doubt, are, nevertheless, declared by him to be the children of God, having, in their baptism, put on Christ; the agent to make men truly God's children being 'faith in Jesus Christ.'

Requesting your readers not to lose sight of these remarks, I remain, for the present, yours faithfully,

THEO. CAMPBELL.

BELFAST, *April 24th*, 1855.

To the Editor of the 'Belfast Chronicle.'

SIR,—The Church Catechism was designed to instruct Christians in the character and nature of their profession, and the conduct answerable thereto. It proceeds on the principle in the words of John the Baptist, 'Bring forth fruits meet for repentance;' or of St. Paul, 'Walk worthy of your high vocation and calling.' Accordingly, it begins at the beginning, even the time and the act when and by which they who, 'by nature, were children of wrath even as others—aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise,' openly before men professed Christianity by baptism, and, in consequence thereof, were received by the Church as Christians, and numbered among its members, 'to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the covenants, and the promises.' It

reminds them that therein they became Christians, in the words, 'Wherein I was made a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of Heaven.' Do not men at baptism become Christians? No Presbyterian who believes the statements of the Westminster Confession can deny this. I have plainly pointed out that that Confession maintains that all the blessings of the Gospel are not only *sealed* (that is, *secured*), but also '*conferred* or *applied*' BY baptism, not only *in*, but BY, it. The Catechism says IN, the Confession says BY, limiting, however, the grace thereof to the elect. According to the doctrine of the Presbyterian Confession and Catechisms, one of the elect, when baptized, could say with truth of his baptism: 'Wherein—aye, and *whereby*—I was made a member of Christ,' etc. The Church differently teaches; for the agent WHEREBY spiritual membership with Christ is effected, is declared in the address with which the service for adult baptism concludes. It says: 'As for you, who have now by baptism put on Christ, it is your part and duty also, *being made the children of God and of the light* BY FAITH IN JESUS CHRIST, to walk answerably to your Christian calling,' etc.

If the Catechism asserted that *by* baptism a man is made a Christian, the language would be justified, on the principle dwelt on in my preceding letter, that 'there is in the sacraments a spiritual relation or sacramental union between the sign and the thing signified, so that the *names and effects of the one are attributed to the other*.' This principle justifies the language of the Catechism, and would justify it even if it were more decided than it is.

Another important view of the words is, that they are to be used by the baptized party himself, as containing *the profession he made and the character he assumed at his baptism*; and, as taught him by the Church, are of the same import as St. Paul's injunction to the Romans: 'Reckon ye yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God

through Jesus Christ our Lord' (Rom. vi. 10). Why should they (aye, ALL of them) thus regard themselves? Because they had been baptized into the death of Christ, and thus BY BAPTISM *were buried with Him into death and risen again* (verses 3 and 4). So the baptized man now is to *reckon* himself as one with Christ in His death and resurrection; a good exposition of which expression is, 'A member of Christ,' etc. And hence the baptized may say, and should say, of himself, 'Wherein I was buried with Christ and risen again;' or, which is the same, 'Wherein I was made a member of Christ,' etc. The point of the instruction being the personal recognition by the baptized party—the 'reckoning himself' to be the actual character he assumed in, and by, his baptism. Woe be to that man who does not so! It is no wonder that one should speak of the visible Church as a set of 'baptized heathens,' when men are taught NOT *to reckon themselves dead by their baptism unto sin*—not to consider themselves as having been made members of Christ; no wonder they do not acknowledge the authority of Christ as their Master. *Verily, their teachers cause them to err.* But 'the elect alone should be so taught.' Who will point them out? Who can tell who are, and who are not, the elect? Who will dare draw the line? Who will dare say to some, 'Reckon yourselves to be one with Christ,' and to others, 'Reckon not yourselves'? Shall we altogether blot out from the Bible this injunction of the Holy Ghost, because it is addressed to men *as baptized?* It is urged upon *all* the Roman professing Christians: 'Know ye not, that *so many of us* as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into His death?' Again, to the Galatians, as referred to in the preceding letter, the Holy Ghost says: 'Ye are ALL the children of God, by faith in Christ Jesus; for *as many of you* as have been baptized into Jesus Christ have put on Christ' (iii. 26, 27). Were the Romans—were the backsliding Galatians all true

Christians—all of the elect? These are known only to God, and therefore the Scriptures instruct and enjoin all the baptized to consider themselves—'reckon themselves'—one with Christ—His members; and on this presumption are they warned, exhorted, threatened, and will be hereafter judged. God says, 'You only have I known, *therefore* I will punish you for all your iniquities.'

Perhaps some Presbyterian may object thus: Baptism is to be administered only to believers, and, as such, they possess all spiritual blessings *before* they are baptized. This objection holds good as against Irish Presbyterians, whose doctrine is, that baptism 'confers or applies' these blessings. Now, if, as believers, they possess them before baptism, how can baptism confer blessings previously possessed? This is a contradiction in Presbyterian doctrine not easily reconciled. But, as against the Irish Church, the objection does not lie, as may be gathered from preceding remarks, and will be more fully apparent from those that are to follow.

Another may say, We are taught in 'The Directory for Public Worship' that our children 'are Christians and federally holy BEFORE baptism, and THEREFORE are they baptized;' how, then, can they be made Christians in baptism? Another contradiction is this averment in Presbyterian doctrine; but it lies not against the Church, as the Church does not hold that the children of Christians are therefore Christians. Strange teaching this! But if it be true that children are Christians *before* they are baptized, is it not true that they are Christians *after* they are baptized? With what consistency can they, who teach the parents of every child they baptize that their child was *born* a Christian, object to the Church Catechism? Will any Presbyterian minister dare assert that the parents of the children he has baptized were *all* Christians, in the strict sense of the word—all believers, true, undoubted believers, elect? and will he further assert that every child

he baptized was one of the elect? But, if he be a Christian, he is one of the elect.

Some may say, You mistake; the word Christian in that passage is to be understood in a limited sense; externally a Christian—a professing Christian, but not a spiritual Christian. I accept the explanation, and say the words objected to in the Church Catechism are likewise to be taken in the same limited sense, and not as implying any spiritual blessing. The word *Christian* implies all that 'member of Christ, child of God, and inheritor of the kingdom of Heaven' does—this being a good definition of the term Christian; yet are these words used without at all asserting the actual spiritual Christianity of the party to whom they are applied, and this we shall see from Scripture itself.

'Member of Christ' is a metaphor taken from a tree, whose branches are its members. Our Lord Himself speaks of branches in Him which bear no fruit, and must be cut off from Him. They bear no fruit, because not *livingly*—not *spiritually* united to Him. He says: 'I am the true vine, every branch IN ME *that beareth not fruit* He taketh away' (John xv. 1, 2). The same illustration we find in Rom. xi. 17-24. An olive-tree—some branches (Jewish) broken off for unbelief—others (Gentile) graffed on in their place, and a warning to these lest they also be cut off. Branches—members that are *spiritually* united to Christ, are of the elect, and will never be cut off. It does not, therefore, follow that when a man is made *a member of Christ* that he is absolutely and of necessity *a living, spiritual member*. He may be no more than a fruitless branch, which the pruning-knife of heavenly judgment must cut off, and which must be 'cast forth as a branch and be withered.' Surely it is a strange way to 'calm a man's fears and administer an opiate,' to teach him that he is in the field of culture, and in danger of the pruning-knife of judgment!

'Child of God.' This title was applied, as we have seen, by St. Paul to the Galatians as baptized; they put on Christ by baptism, as the mode of their adoption into God's family, and yet among those so baptized and adopted there were those who were children only in name. He that is truly a member of Christ is truly a child of God; while he that is a fruitless member of Christ is only a nominal child of God. Thus God addresses Israel: 'I said ye are all the children of the Most High, but ye shall die like men.' He calls them His people, 'My people'; His Son, 'My Son, My firstborn.' Moses tells the people they 'are the children of the Lord their God.' The Lord complains that He 'had brought up children, but they had rebelled against Him: rebellious children, lying children, that will not hear the law of the Lord.' He is but moderately acquainted with the Word of God who is ignorant of this relationship as existing between God and His circumcised people, and that this very relationship forms the ground of His heavy dealings in judgment with that people. Baptism places us in the same relationship to God, without at all implying that a spiritual birth takes place in consequence.

'Inheritor of the kingdom of heaven.' The visible Church is one interpretation of this phrase: and in that kingdom there are '*tares and wheat*.' The Gospel net 'gathers of every kind, good and bad,' who are mixed therein, but are distinguishable only by God.

Baptism may do no more for us than circumcision did for the Jews, but it does as much. It gives us a right, on repentance and faith, to all the spiritual blessings of the Gospel. The baptized are, as it were, a circle, within which God's blessings descend, and the sacrament of baptism admits us within that circle and numbers us among the people, the children of God, and the possessors of His blessings. The blessings are enumerated by St. Paul (Rom. ix. 4), and asserted to belong to Israel.

'Who are Israelites? to whom pertaineth THE ADOPTION, and the glory, and THE COVENANTS, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and THE PROMISES?' By baptism we are admitted into the number of this people; hence *the adoption* becomes ours by baptism, as it was Israel's of old by circumcision: and, accordingly, *children of God* is our standing, as it was theirs, and yet this may only be for our greater judgment. THE FIELD OF CULTURE IS THE FIELD OF JUDGMENT.

It must not be overlooked, in an examination of the subject, that baptism is not 'a few drops of water,' but a sacrament instituted by Christ Himself, consisting of two parts—*the outward and visible sign* and *the inward and spiritual grace*. If the latter be absent, there is no sacrament. And, moreover, the Catechism further teaches that 'repentance and faith are required of persons to be baptized.' If these be present, there is, and must be, 'the inward and spiritual grace,' and there is, then, the sacrament; and it is of *baptism as a sacrament*, when these spiritual graces and acts attend the outward washing, that it is declared, in the fullest sense of the word, that in baptism we 'are made members of Christ,' etc. But, because it is not given to us to judge of the existence of spiritual internal graces, we must only presume their presence on the profession of the candidate, and administer the ordinance. And, because of the possibility of false profession, *a secondary and lower sense of the words exists*, which enables us to predicate them of every baptized person; for, in the one sense or in the other, are they true of all such; true for blessing, or true for judgment. The secondary sense exists, but we must pass the judgment absolutely, or rather teach the party so to pass it on himself; and for this absolute judgment we have Scripture warrant. The case of Simon Magus furnishes it (Acts viii. 13); 'Simon himself *believed* also and was baptized.' Did he *believe?* 'He had neither part nor

lot in the matter; he was in the gall of bitterness and bond of iniquity.' He *professed* faith, and the Holy Ghost records that *he believed*. So, in baptism, men profess to be God's children, and *in God's own appointed way;* and we, following the warrant of Holy Scripture, so declare of them, although it may be no more true of them than it was of Simon himself.

The Church does not consider baptism essential to salvation. The Catechism says it is 'GENERALLY necessary to salvation.' *Generally*, NOT UNIVERSALLY, NOT ABSOLUTELY; and further designates it '*a* means,' not *the* means of grace. The service for the baptism of adults contains an exhortation, the opening words of which are: 'Beloved, ye hear in this Gospel the express words of our Saviour Christ, that, except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. Whereby ye may perceive *the great necessity of this sacrament*, WHEN IT MAY BE HAD.' Yet, Dissenters do not hesitate to charge the Church with teaching the *absolute* necessity of baptism for salvation. Is not such a charge a groundless slander?

One of the canons requires the clergy to baptize *every* child that is brought to them to the church. The canons were enacted with reference to a *Christian* country or people, and have no bearing on heathens. '*Every* child' is in opposition to those in a clergyman's own parish; the children not only of his own parishioners, but of others; the children of the poor as well as of the rich; of him who pays no stipend, as of the man who pays; of the Dissenter, as of the Churchman. In a word, the child of every member of *the visible Church*. This is the correct interpretation of the word 'believers,' as the parties who are to be admitted to the sacraments, viz., 'members of the visible Church.' The Shorter Catechism has two questions which mutually elucidate each other, and serve to explain this point. Q. 92: 'A sacrament

is an holy ordinance instituted by Christ; wherein, BY *sensible signs*, Christ and the benefits of the new covenant are represented, *sealed* (which means *secured*), and *applied* to believers.' Q. 95: 'Baptism is not to be administered to any that are out of *the visible Church*, till they *profess* their faith in Christ, and obedience to Him; but the infants of *such as are members of the visible Church* are to be baptized.' Thus, 'the believer' is one who *professes* faith; not one who truly believes, or who gives any evidence of his faith, *save his bare profession;* and *the child of a believer is the child of a member of the* VISIBLE CHURCH. (See, also, question 166 in the Larger Catechism.) 'The visible Church,' says the same Catechism (Q. 62), 'is a society made up of all such as in all ages and places of the world do *profess* the true religion; and of their children.' The vast majority of the members of the visible Church are mere professors, really unbelievers; yet must their infants be baptized, and are baptized, and by Presbyterian ministers are said to be *Christians* even before their baptism; and this, although the Catechism further asserts (and asserts truly), that 'all that hear the Gospel and live in the visible Church are not saved; but they only who are true members of the Church invisible' (Q. 61).

Besides all that is said above of the visible Church and its constituents, *the Confession of Faith* calls it 'THE KINGDOM of the Lord Jesus Christ, *the house and* FAMILY of God, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation.' Here, then, we find a statement precisely analogous to the much misunderstood and objected to words of the Church Catechism. Baptism makes a man 'a member of the visible Church,' which is 'the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ'; hence baptism makes a man 'an inheritor of the kingdom of Heaven.' Again: baptism makes a man a child 'of the house and family of God'; so that, according to Presbyterian doctrine,

every baptized person may say, 'Wherein I was made a member of the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, and a child of the house and family of God.' Is not this precisely the statement of the Church Catechism?

In the rite of confirmation, the candidate having been first duly instructed by his minister in the nature of his professed Christianity; and then solemnly before God and the Church interrogated as to his desire to renew his baptismal vow, and to abide by it; and having answered 'I do,' the bishop pronounces him to be one who has been 'regenerated by water (baptism) and the Holy Ghost, and whose sins God has forgiven.' This is the Church's judgment, pronounced on his own public profession of faith, and is, in effect, the same that was affirmed of Simon Magus.

Confirmation is the Church's mode of admission to the Lord's table, to which none should be admitted but believers, but Christians, but God's children. Before admission there must be a judgment on this head. Hence the bishop's declaration is merely the Church's decision as to the party's fitness to be received at the table of the Lord. Some Presbyterian churches retain the rite of Confirmation. Others have devised an expedient, whose fatal results God alone can tell. There is a preparation day, on which the minister gives a token, without which no one can present himself at the Lord's table. I dwell not on the Romish origin of this custom, according to which a man must go to confession to *prepare* for communion; but I ask what is the *practical* bearing of such a proceeding? Is this not the minister's judgment of the man's fitness for the Holy Communion? Does not the minister hereby endorse his Christianity? Does he not, in effect, declare that the party 'is born of the Spirit, and that all his sins are forgiven'? and must not the man who receives the token naturally enough so regard it? And though in the sermon on the communion day the

minister may faithfully portray the characters who alone should approach the table, and warn others not to present themselves, yet such persons have each his token in his hand, and, in the self-deception of the human heart, cannot but consider it as the minister's declaration that he is a meet partaker of the ordinance. Why should he doubt it? He has his minister's word for it, in the token on which his eyes are resting. Here, indeed, is a something to 'calm the fears, and administer an opiate that may prove awfully pernicious. . . . Of the evil generated by this delusion I need not speak. The fearful aggregate will be known only at the judgment of the great day!' The constant repetition of the practice adds to 'the delusion.'

Different is the Church's action in this matter. *Once*, after solemn instruction and public interrogation, and profession of faith, does it proclaim the party's fitness for the Holy Communion, and then leave it to each man's own conscience; at all times exhorting him to examine himself, nor dare to approach and eat unworthily. It is left as a personal matter between the man and his God, save only in the case of 'notorious evil living.' The token system is *a continued repetition of the rite of confirmation*, so far as proclaiming the person's fitness for the Lord's table is concerned, accompanied by what I have above pointed out, and believe to be most dangerous tendencies.

Sacraments are for the visible Church, and for it alone. They are for man's judgment of his brother man, and not for God's; and when the ordinance is *rightly* (that is, in all things pertaining to its due celebration) administered and received, it is the Church's bounden duty to judge therefrom, and recognise the receiver as a believer in the Lord. This is inseparable from the idea of a visible Church; about such alone are the Articles, to which in previous letters I have referred, concerned. 'The in-

visible Church' is not, for it could not, be taken into account—it is far out of the reach of mortal man's vision and judgment; it is known to God alone. Once there was no visible Church marked off by sacraments from the world, but circumcision came in to encircle the professing people of God, form them into a society, and separate them, as a visible Church, from the world; this office baptism now performs. It is also a profession of discipleship, which the Lord requires to enable us to judge of that discipleship. Baptism does not absolutely confer the graces connected with it, it only does so *quoad* the visible Church. Thus, when Saul was converted on the road to Damascus, his sins were all forgiven: 'by faith he was justified.' He was a member of—by faith admitted into—the invisible Church; yet Ananias says: 'Be baptized, and wash away thy sins.' Wash them away in the eyes of the visible Church, by that sacrament instituted of Christ for this purpose, and thus join that Church which will then receive you as one 'regenerate of water and of the Spirit;' as 'a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of Heaven.'

The averments of the Church, in Articles, Services, and Catechism, respect only the visible Church. No declaration is made in regard of the invisible Church, as to the party in God's sight; and the not keeping this distinction clearly in view is the cause of all the confusion that exists in the minds of men on the subject of baptism. The attempt to legislate for the invisible Church has resulted in the deplorable divisions which men foster for their own selfish ends.

That the Church's declarations do not respect the character of her children as before God, in respect to the invisible Church, is evident from the following prayers (among others) for the spirit's work in the heart, prayers for what popular theology at the present day calls (but calls improperly) regeneration:

'O God, make clean our hearts within us, and take not Thy holy spirit from us.'—*Morning and Evening Prayer.*

'Grant that we, being regenerate, and made Thy children by adoption and grace, may *daily be renewed by Thy holy Spirit.*'—*Collect for Christmas-day.*

'Grant us *the true circumcision of the spirit.*'—*Collect for the Circumcision.*

'*Create* and make in us *new* and contrite *hearts.*'—*Collect for Ash Wednesday.*

'Cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of Thy holy Spirit.'—*Collect in Communion Service.*

Sir, I have thus endeavoured to fulfil the promise given in my last letter to Mr. Knox, when that gentleman so abruptly closed our correspondence. I have stated my own conviction of the Church's doctrine of baptism, and the grounds on which I consider it Scriptural; and, with one word more to disprove the assertion that we hold Popish doctrine, I now close the subject until I reproduce these letters, and previous correspondence, in pamphlet form.

The principle of the Romish doctrine of this sacrament is, that it *impresses character*, confers moral (spiritual) character on the recipients. The Presbyterian doctrine is the same; the difference between the two Churches is one of detail, of extent, not of principle; the Presbyterian Church limiting the efficacy of baptism to the elect. The Church of England and Ireland holds not that the sacraments impress character on the recipients, save only symbolically, and as respects the visible Church; and, consequently, the character, so to speak, is *external*, designed only for the Church's judgment and treatment of men.—I remain, sir, faithfully yours,

THEO. CAMPBELL.

BELFAST, *April 30th*, 1855.

P.S.—Baptism, according to the Westminster Confession, 'REALLY CONFERS' grace 'to such (whether of age or infants) as that grace belongeth unto.' Hence, at least as regards 'infants,' it is conferred *ex opere operato;* and this is 'the seminal principle of Popery.'

ST. PATRICK AND THE EARLY IRISH CHURCH.

CHRISTIANITY was introduced into Ireland at a very early date; by almost all writers supposed to have been by the immediate disciples of St. John. As proof of its Eastern origin, the erection of seven contiguous churches in different parts of the island is confidently appealed to, a practice said to be derived from the mention of the seven churches in the book of the Revelation; also the tonsure or mode of cutting the hair, and the time for keeping Easter. 'This Easter that I observe,' said Bishop Colman, an Irish bishop in England, at the Synod of Whitby, held A.D. 664, 'is what I have received from those that were over me, who sent me to be bishop here, which all our fathers—men beloved of God—are known to have celebrated after the same manner. It is the same which the blessed evangelist St. John, the disciple specially beloved of our Lord, with all the churches that he did oversee, did follow.' This is one of the many proofs that can be adduced of Ireland's independence of Rome; that, in fact, far from any connection existing between the two churches, the greatest enmity prevailed. Dr. O'Halloran, a distinguished antiquary, speaking of this period, says: 'A most uncompromising enmity existed in the minds of the Irish people against everything connected with Rome. Even when St. Patrick arrived in Ireland, and attempted to exercise some juris-

diction over them, he was informed by St. Iber, that "they never acknowledged the supremacy of a foreigner," and therefore protested against his claims.' Hume's testimony is valuable: 'The Irish followed the doctrines of their first teachers, and never acknowledged any subjection to the See of Rome.' Mr. Grose states 'that Polycarp sent missionaries to spread the Gospel in the western and northern parts of Europe, who settled Episcopacy, and gave a pure and uncorrupted ritual to their converts. Their liturgy agreed with the Greek, and the religion of the Irish continued for ten centuries different from that of Rome, which is a strong evidence of our receiving the Gospel not from Roman, but from Greek, missionaries.' Dr. O'Halloran, already quoted, says: 'I strongly suspect that by Asiatic or African missionaries, or through them by Spanish ones, were our ancestors instructed in Christianity, because they rigidly adhered to their customs as to tonsure and the time of Easter. Certain it is, that Patrick found an hierarchy established in Ireland.' Thierry bears the same testimony, referring to Bede as his authority. Speaking of the insolence of Augustin's successors in England, he writes: 'they even extended their ambitious pretensions over the priests of the Island of Erin, who were as independent as the Britons of all foreign supremacy, and so zealous for the Christian faith that their country was called the Island of Saints. But this merit of sanctity, without a complete submission to the power of the Roman Church, was nugatory in the estimation of the members of that Church. To the inhabitants of Erin they sent messages replete with pride and rancour: "we, the deputies from the Apostolic See to the western regions, aforetimes foolishly gave credit to your island's reputation for sanctity; but we now know, and can no longer doubt, that you are no better than the Britons. Of this the journey of Columban into Gaul, and that of

our Dagamman (or Dagan) to Britain, has fully convinced us: for amongst other things, this Dagamman, passing through the place where we dwelt, has refused to take his repast in the same house with us."' Again, he says: 'As soon as the Roman Church had established her dominion in Britain by the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons, she made continual efforts (from A.D. 600 to 1066) to extend over the inhabitants of the island of Erin the empire which she pretended to exercise over all the worshippers of Christ. As there was on the Irish soil no Pagan conqueror to convert, the Popes confined themselves to negotiations by letters and messages, and endeavoured by such pacific means to induce the Irish to establish in their island an ecclesiastical hierarchy similar to that on the Continent, and, like it, capable of serving the ambition of the Pontifical throne. . . . The Church of Ireland had not a single archbishop, none of its members had occasion to go to Rome to solicit, or to buy the Pontifical Pallium; so that this Church, enjoying full independence with regard to all foreign churches and its administration, like that of every free society, being in the hands of dignitaries elected and recalled by itself alone, was at an early period regarded as schismatic by the Conclave of St. John of Lateran; and a long system of attacks was directed against it.' Once more, 'Thus, in spite of their endeavours to treat with the Irish kings during the four centuries and a half which had elapsed between the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons and the descent of the Normans in England, the Popes did not obtain the smallest change in the religious practices, or the organization of the clergy of Erin, nor could they impose the levy of the smallest tax upon the inhabitants of that island.'

From all these testimonies it is evident that the Irish Church did not receive its Christianity from the Church of Rome, nay, that it refused communion with her as a

heretical Church, protesting against her claims, and was, consequently, a Protestant Church long before the designation was known. It is also evident that Christianity was introduced into Ireland at a very early period. In the fourth century several churches were built and colleges founded, especially that of Heber, or Iber, in Leinster. Several Irish ecclesiastics are recorded to have gone forth as missionaries before the close of the century. In the year 303 Ireland afforded an asylum for the persecuted Christians of Britain during the Diocletian persecution.

That education had made great progress in Ireland St. Jerome is witness, who informs us that Celestius, the follower of the heretic Pelagius, was an Irishman. Before he fell into his grievous errors he wrote several letters to his parents, of which three are still extant, which prove that he and they were Christians. 'They were written in the form,' as we are told, 'of little books, and full of such piety, as to make them necessary to all who love God.' Their date is A.D. 369.

St. Patrick's connection with the preaching of Christianity in Ireland has been, it would seem, purposely, by Roman Catholic writers, involved in much confusion. Resolved at all hazards to establish for him a Roman mission, and thus connect the early Irish Church with Rome, they date his visit to this island in the fifth century, the year selected being 432; and this, despite the inextricable difficulties which this date creates. There can be no doubt that Pope Celestine sent Palladius, attended by a large retinue, among whom were many ecclesiastics, to this country (Ireland) in the year 431. Prosper of Aquitaine, in his chronicle, notes that 'Palladius, appointed first bishop, is sent by Pope Celestine to the Scots believing in Christ.'

The ancient Scots were the Irish, a colony of whom settled in North Britain, from them called Scotland. 'First Bishop' here may mean either chief bishop over

the Irish Church, or first missionary bishop to Ireland, to convert the heathen; but this it cannot mean, as he was commissioned to 'the Scots believing in Christ.' It may mean, however, that, the believing Scots not having been regularly constituted as a Church under episcopal government, Palladius was sent in the hope that they would accept him as their bishop. But this is contrary to history, as long prior to that era a hierarchy of bishops existed in Ireland. It appears to me that the Pope's object in the mission was to try and extend his usurped supremacy over a Christian Church which had not hitherto acknowledged his claims.

Palladius landed in the South of Ireland, where he was opposed by the Church, which refused subjection to a foreigner, and by the pagans. He built three churches —one significantly called 'the house of the Romans.' Notwithstanding his mission not proving successful, he retired to Scotland, where he died. His stay in Ireland is said to have been only of a few months' continuance, or even a few days. There is a purpose in this, as we shall see. Short indeed it must have been; but from the fact that he built three churches, and, we may conclude, formed three congregations, he must have remained longer than a few days, or even months. The object of Roman Catholic writers in shortening his stay was to leave room for St. Patrick the following year, 432; that is, to justify the Pope in so soon sending another bishop, as they assert he did; for Pope Celestine died in 432, and if they did not settle on this year they could not have St. Patrick commissioned by Celestine at all. One circumstance which leads to so much confusion is that Palladius was also called Patricius, and hence almost his entire history has been attributed to St. Patrick. It is from him, not from Patrick, that the common name Paddy is derived.

Dr. Todd, in his elaborate volume, specifies the year 440 or 442 as the likely date of St. Patrick's landing as

a missionary on our shores. This negatives the idea of a Roman mission at once; but even assuming the year 432 to be correct, there is not the shadow of a foundation for the legend that Celestine sent him to this island. For Patrick, if this date be correct, was ordained by Germanus, Bishop of Auxerre, and was by him sent to Ireland. That he was sent in 432 is, however, a fragment of the history of Palladius transferred to Patrick.

In a recently published book, entitled 'St. Patrick, Apostle of Ireland, in the Third Century,' Mr. Nicholson, in my opinion, incontestably proves that our patron saint came to our shores in the latter half of the *third* century, nearly two centuries before the usually assigned date. The late Sir William Betham, in his 'Antiquarian Researches,' had previously arrived at the conclusion 'that Ireland had been Christianized by St. Patrick long before the year 432.' On this supposition, and it is more than supposition—it is fact—all obscurities and contradictions and confusions disappear, and a rational history of the saint remains; and, of course, the fiction of a mission from Rome is altogether exploded. Patrick's history is remarkable. The place of his birth cannot be determined with accuracy—whether it was in Gaul or Britain. But if it were the former, the latter soon became his home, for in his 'Confession' he speaks of going into Britain as 'going to my country and kindred'—(*patriam et parentes*). He informs us in his epistle to Coroticus that he was of noble birth, according to the flesh, having for his father a decurio, or Roman magistrate. In his 'Confession' he mentions his father's name, Calphurinus, and his grandfather's, Potitus. The former, according to the existing copy, made in the eighth century and preserved in the 'Book of Armagh,' was a deacon, and the latter a presbyter.

It is very difficult to reconcile these two statements. How the deacon of a Christian Church could have been a

Roman magistrate, and that in an age when Christianity was proscribed in the empire, is hard to believe. Besides, Patrick informs us that he resigned his nobility, not blushing on that account, nor regretting it, as he did it for the benefit of others; and, further, that when he became a servant of Christ Jesus our Lord, he was disowned by his relations. And again, he says that he dwelt among barbarians (the Irish) 'a proselyte and exile for the love of God.' However the discrepancy is to be reconciled, I certainly agree with Mr. Nicholson, that 'if St. Patrick forfeited his title to nobility by becoming a Christian *bishop*, he certainly could not have inherited it from a Christian *deacon*.' I assume, then, that St. Patrick was a noble Roman, as the word Patricius itself asserts, and that wherever he was born, his father, while he was still a child, was settled in Britain, while still under Roman power, as a magistrate. These things being so, we can have little trouble in settling on the part of the island in which they lived. It was either the North of England, or the South of Scotland, most probably the northern bank of the Clyde, near Dumbarton.

When sixteen years of age, along with many others, he was taken prisoner by an Irish prince, who had made a descent on the coasts of Britain. He was carried captive to Ireland, to the county of Antrim, where he remained six years, employed in feeding pigs and herding cattle. Affliction humbled his heart, and brought him to serious reflection. Having effected his escape, he reached a port 'two hundred miles' distant from the county of Antrim—consequently in the south of the island—where he embarked, and after three days' sailing arrived at some country, most likely Gaul (indeed, it could have been no other), and having travelled for twenty-eight days through a desert, he arrived at human habitation. He informs us that 'a few years subsequently he was with his parents in the Britanniæ.' In reference to this time, he writes in

his 'Confession,' they 'received me as a son, and earnestly entreated me that I would never depart from them after the many calamities I had undergone; and then, indeed, I saw in the night a man, whose name was Victricius, coming, as it were, from Ireland with innumerable letters, and he gave me one of them, and I read the beginning of the letter containing "the view of the Irish"; and whilst I read aloud the beginning of the letter, I thought I heard, at that moment, the voice of those who were near the wood Focluth, which is near the western sea; and they cried thus, as with one voice, "We entreat thee, holy youth, that thou mayst come, and henceforth walk amongst us;" and I was greatly pricked in my heart, and could not read any further; and so I awoke. Thanks be to God, that after many years the Lord granted to them according to their cry. Again, on another night—I know not, God knoweth, whether it was within me, or nigh me, in words most skilfully expressed, which I heard, but could not understand, except at the last part of the speech—He thus addressed me: "He who gave His life for thee;" and so I awoke rejoicing.'

He could not resist what he believed to be a Divine call. His friends endeavoured to persuade him to give up his intentions, even imprisoning him for embracing Christianity. He thus writes:

'Whence has it been my lot to comprehend and so highly esteem this so great and salutary gift of God, that I should abandon my country and parents, and refuse the many gifts which were offered me with weeping and tears. And I gave great offence by this, and acted against the wishes of not a few of my seniors; but God overruling me, I in no way consented nor complied with them; yet not I, but the grace of God, who conquered in me, and I held out against them all, so that I might come to the Irish people to preach the Gospel; and bore the insults of the unbelieving, and the many persecutions, even to bonds,

and listened to reproachful language about my purposed wandering to a foreign country, and that I should give up myself and my nobility for the benefit of others.'

In St. Patrick's own words we have thus the history of his mission to Ireland. He does not once even allude to any connection with Rome, and the entire circumstances of it preclude the supposition. He went on what he believed to be exclusively a Divine call, unsent by man. As to his ordination, the most probable inference is that he had been ordained both deacon and presbyter while in Gaul. He was still only a priest when he devoted himself to this work. He was young, between twenty-five and thirty years of age, about the year 254. His ordination as a bishop took place subsequently—most probably in Britain—during some interval of his labours.

On landing in Ireland he proceeded to the scene of his former captivity, in the county of Antrim, where he met with signal success. Afterwards he travelled through the entire island, preaching the faith. He was often in danger from the pagans and their priests, the Druids. His success has been much exaggerated. He did not convert the entire island; but having ordained many bishops and presbyters, and having constituted Armagh the seat of the Primacy, he died at an advanced age, variously stated at from eighty-two to one hundred and twenty years—most likely the former. He died in the parish of Saul, in Down, and was buried in Downpatrick.

It will have been seen from the above narrative how utterly without foundation is the story of St. Patrick's mission from the Church of Rome; but from his writings it can be fairly adduced that he had learned the Scriptures in the Greek language, and consequently must have been instructed and ordained by bishops of the Greek Church in Gaul. I cannot pass over the testimony of a celebrated writer on the ecclesiastical affairs of Ireland.

'There is,' he says, 'something very singular in the

ecclesiastical history of Ireland. The Christian Church of that country, as founded by St. Patrick and his predecessors, existed for many ages free and unshackled. For about 700 years this Church maintained its independence; it had no connection with England, and differed on points of importance from Rome. The first work of Henry II. was to reduce the Church of Ireland into obedience to the Roman Pontiff. Accordingly he procured a council of the Irish clergy, to be held at Cashel in 1172. The combined influence and intrigues of Henry and the Pope prevailed. This council put an end to the ancient Church of Ireland, and submitted it to the yoke of Rome. That ominous apostasy has been followed by a series of calamities hardly to be equalled in the world. From the days of St. Patrick to the Council of Cashel was a bright and glorious career for Ireland. From the sitting of this council to our time the lot of Ireland has been unmixed evil, and all her history a tale of woe.'

A more remarkable statement could not be produced, and, though there are some inaccuracies in it, I have given it in full.

The doctrines taught by St. Patrick and his successors were Scriptural, and what are now termed Protestant. The study of the sacred Scriptures was Patrick's greatest delight; he would spend whole days and nights in expounding them to the people. He was succeeded by many eminent men—Columba, Columbanus, Finnian, Canice, Kevin, Aidan, Finan, Colman.

Columba was born of noble parents. Having in his early youth instigated a bloody and unjust war, when he became sensible of his sin, he devoted himself to a mission to the unconverted Picts residing in the north of Scotland. Bede gives a full account of his mission and its success. The isle of Ely, or Iona (now St. Columkill), was bestowed upon him, where he established a monastery, from which went forth those missionaries who con-

verted the North and Midland Britons. Aidan converted the kingdom of Northumberland. He was succeeded by Finan and Colman as bishops. Through them Christianity spread southward, even to the banks of the Thames. Thus the principal parts of England and Scotland owe their Christianity to the Church of Ireland.

Other Irish Christians scattered themselves at this time over the Continent of Europe, where many villages and churches bearing their name still remain as monuments to their memories. Ireland became famous for learning and religion. Many from England and the Continent repaired to her colleges and other seats of learning and piety for instruction. The Irish received them with full Christian hospitality, even at times defraying all their necessary charges. 'In many things,' says Thierry, 'especially in religion, they (the Irish) were enthusiasts, and willingly intermingled the Christian worship with their poetry and literature, which was perhaps the most cultivated in all Western Europe. Their island possessed a multitude of saints and learned men, venerated alike in England and Gaul: for no country had furnished a greater number of Christian missionaries animated by no other motive than pure zeal and an ardent desire of communicating to foreign nations the opinions and the faith of their native country. The Irish were great travellers, and always gained the hearts of those whom they visited, by the extreme ease with which they conformed to their customs and ways of life.'

In 703 the Northmen, or Danes, first invaded Ireland. For more than two centuries they ravaged the country, plundering and destroying churches and seats of learning, and filling every part of the land with slaughter. Frequently the Irish were victorious. At last a decisive battle was fought at Clontarf, near Dublin, when the Irish, under Brian Boru, King of Munster, drove the Danes into the sea. A public-house long marked the spot, having as

its sign a full-length picture of the king, and underneath the following lines :

> 'Brian Boru, King of Munster, and conqueror of the Danes,
> On this spot he drowned their last remains,
> And freed his country from the tyrant's chains.'

Many of the Danes were allowed to settle in the country for the purposes of trade, still retaining in their hands three maritime cities—Dublin, Waterford and Limerick. During the Danish times one of the most remarkable of the Irish was Cormac MacCuillenan, who held the double offices of king and bishop. He was celebrated for writing books and fighting battles. He enlarged the famous Psalter of Cashel, which had been commenced by Benean, said to be a contemporary of St. Patrick. He wrote a glossary of Irish words. He was slain in battle A.D. 908. After some time the Danes were converted to Christianity, and had bishops over them. The first bishop of Dublin was Donagh, or Donatus, about 1040.

On September 28, 1066, William the Conqueror landed on the shores of England ; the Church of England, though at that time in most respects in agreement with Rome, yet did not acknowledge the supremacy of the Pope, as that prelate desired. In order to bring it into perfect subjection, the Pope invited and encouraged William to the enterprise. With his blessing the Normans invaded and conquered England. They were devoted servants of the Papacy. As soon as they had made themselves masters of the island, they seized on the property of the nobles and the sees of the bishops, and filled the latter with creatures of the Pope. The Danes in Ireland claimed kindred with the Normans, and beholding their brethren advanced to the high offices of bishop and archbishop in England, conceived it would be more dignified if they sent their bishops-elect in future to the Archbishop of Canterbury for consecration. The Irish

Church protested against this practice, but in vain. The consequences soon after became apparent, proving most disastrous to the Church; a door of admission being thus opened for the claims of the Church of Rome to supremacy, of which she was not slow to avail herself.

In 1106 a sad proof was afforded of the influence of this union with Canterbury. Gille, or Gillebert, a foreigner, educated in Normandy, a zealous Romanist, was elected Bishop (the first) of Limerick. As soon as he was firmly established in his see, he cunningly set to work to introduce Roman customs. There were at that time in use in Ireland many different liturgies. Gille professed to be greatly scandalized at this, and urged upon the bishops and clergy the propriety of uniformity in public prayer. They, in their simplicity, ignorant of Romish guile, requested him to write such a form for them. He accordingly wrote the Roman order of service, complaining in the preface of the prevalence of 'different and schismatical orders.' He addressed this book to the dissenting bishops and presbyters of Ireland. In the year 1094 he sent a present of twenty-five pearls to Anselm, the then Archbishop of Canterbury, and congratulated him on his triumph over the sovereign in the affair of the investitures. For these services Gille was appointed Pope's legate (the first) in Ireland.

The next prelate that exerted himself to reduce the Church of Ireland to subjection to the Bishop of Rome was Malachy O'Morgair. He had been elected Bishop of Connor, but afterwards obtained the primacy. The custom of hereditary succession in the several sees was general throughout Ireland. This was peculiarly offensive to a Church which enjoins celibacy on her clergy. Accordingly the practice must be done away with if the Church is to be modelled after the fashion of Rome. Celsus, the Bishop of Armagh, had resented all along the interference of the English primate. Taking a firm stand

on this point, he refused to separate from his wife and children. He was, however, prevailed on, when dying, to send his crozier to Malachy, in token of his appointment to the primacy. After many severe struggles with the old family, Malachy ascended the primatial chair; but after three years the old family compelled him to resign, when he retired to the suffragan bishopric of Down. Two years after he determined to undertake a journey to Rome, to solicit the pall, or archiepiscopal cloak, for the Bishops of Armagh and Cashel. Innocent received him with great courtesy, and well he might, for never before had such a sight been witnessed—a bishop of the Irish Church soliciting the confirmation of appointments to Irish bishoprics from the Pope. 'He informed himself accurately by his means,' writes Bishop Mant, 'of the condition of the Irish Church, confirmed the establishment of the archbishopric, invested him with the office of his legate in Ireland, and dismissed him with tokens of singular respect and benevolence: but with regard to the palls, he acquainted him that a matter of that consequence ought to be transacted with great solemnity, and by the common suffrages of a national council, which the Pope advised him to call on his return to Ireland, with a promise that upon their request the palls should be granted.'

On his return Malachy exerted himself in his new office to reduce the Church to conformity with Rome. He was ably seconded by some Cistercian monks whom he had brought back with him, and who established several houses of their order in Ireland. Matters at last being deemed ripe, a national council assembled at Holmpatrick (1148), attended, it is said, by fifteen bishops and several of the inferior clergy, when and where it was determined to solicit the palls. Malachy was appointed to convey the request to the Pope, but he died in France on his journey to Rome. He was afterwards canonized by the Pope,

being the first Irishman admitted by the Church of Rome to be a saint.

Three years later the Pope sent over as his legate John Paparo, with four palls, respectively, for the Archbishops of Armagh, Cashel, Dublin, and Tuam. A synod was held at Kells (March 9, 1152) for the purpose of reorganizing the Irish Church, and on a new basis. Two new archbishoprics were founded—Dublin and Tuam—and the number of bishops considerably reduced. Gelasius, Archbishop of Armagh, 'was the first archbishop,' says Dr. Mant, 'who compromised the independence of the National Church of Ireland by accepting the stamp and ensign of his ecclesiastical dignity from the hands of a foreign prelate.' It may be added that many of the bishops and other clergy refused submission to the decrees of this synod. 'Notwithstanding the appearance of national assent given to these measures, the old spirit of independence yet prevailed; the clergy of Ireland showed little docility in their submission to the new hierarchical order, and the people had a repugnance for the foreign practices.' The same writer adds: 'The court at Rome, still dissatisfied with the Irish in spite of their concessions, continued to give them the epithet of bad Christians, and lukewarm Christians, rebellious to the apostolic discipline. It watched as attentively as ever for an opportunity of obtaining a stronger hold of them, by associating its own ambition with some temporal ambition—nor was it long till such an opportunity presented itself. The Pope then reigning was Adrian IV., an Englishman, by name Breakspeare, of Saxon origin. Henry II., Norman King of England, having resolved to invade Ireland, like his predecessor on the throne, the first William, applied to the Pope for, and obtained, his sanction. Adrian issued the celebrated Bull, in which he assigned Ireland to the English king as *lord* thereof, arrogating the kingship to himself. Between these two

the liberties of the Irish Church were to be trampled underfoot, and the supremacy of the Pope established in our land. Henry was unable from other occupations at once to carry his design into execution. After a short time certain unforeseen events occurred, which led to the first hostile invasion of Ireland by the English. Dermod M'Morrogh, King of Leinster, had invaded the territories of Tiernan O'Ruarch, and carried off his wife, Dervogal, whom he induced to live with him in his castle at Ferns. This act of wickedness excited a general spirit of indignation among his countrymen, the obligation of marriage being held in high repute by the Irish. After many battles he was driven out of his kingdom by Roderic O'Connor, King of Connaught and chief monarch of Ireland. In this distress he applied for aid to Henry, who seized the opportunity to carry out his long projected design to invade Ireland.

Such was the occasion which the Norman monarch of England deemed propitious, in accordance with the Bull of the Pope, to invade and subjugate this country. Can we wonder that Ireland should be England's difficulty? Could the blessing of God be expected to follow such an undertaking? Be it remembered, also, that the result was to be the forcing the supremacy of Rome on an unwilling Church and people. Verily, our ancestors erred greatly. Henry, unable himself to come to Ireland at that time, gave full permission to, and exhorted, his subjects to assist Dermod. Accordingly, some bodies of Norman troops, headed by Fitz-Gerald and Fitz-Stephen, and other leaders, landed at Baganbun, in the county of Wexford, and, after some fighting, advanced upon the town and took it. The following year Strongbow, Earl of Pembroke, sailed for the contiguous harbour of Waterford. As he sailed up the river, there stood on the Wexford side the Danish tower of Hook, and on the Waterford side the Irish church of Crook. It was necessary for his forces to

land; but, not knowing the country, he inquired the respective names of the tower and church, and, having ascertained them, asked, 'Shall we advance and take the town by Hook, or by Crook?' Hence originated a proverb now in general use. Waterford was taken, and, some time afterwards, Dublin. Strongbow, having married Dermod's daughter, became virtual King of Leinster; his power increasing, he threatened to conquer the entire country. Henry felt alarmed at this new power springing up by his side. He recalled the English from Ireland, seized on Strongbow's estates in England, and forbade any of his subjects to go to Ireland. Strongbow was therefore compelled to abandon all idea of further conquests. He resigned Dublin and the other conquered towns to Henry, who restored him his estates in England. Henry, having thus quietly got possession of the country, made Dublin a present to the citizens of Bristol. The original deed is still preserved in the Castle of Dublin.

Having determined to visit his new dominions, he landed at Waterford October 17, 1171. Thither repaired Dermod and other southern princes, chiefly Normans, as also the Norman ecclesiastics, who all favoured Rome, and swore fidelity to him. Thence he proceeded to Dublin, where he summoned the kings and ecclesiastics to his court, declaring that by the grant of the Church he was 'Lord of Ireland.' The kings and clergy of the south and east came, but the King of Connaught refused, as he himself was chief of all Ireland. 'It was equally in vain that the summons of the Norman king was carried into the north of Ireland. Not a chief of the province of Thuall, or Ulster, came to do homage at the Norman court of Dublin. The nominal sovereignty of Henry II. remained bounded by a line drawn from north-east to south-west—from the mouth of the Boyne to the mouth of the Shannon.'

Before leaving Ireland Henry gave directions that a

synod of the bishops and clergy should be held at Cashel. Many laws were passed for the governance of the Church; the character of all will be understood from the last, that 'all Church ordinances in all parts of Ireland should, for the future, be regulated according to the system of the Holy Church, as observed in the Church of England.' Yet we are informed by Dr. Lanigan that wherever the natives maintained their independence, 'clergy and people followed their own ecclesiastical rules, as if the Synod of Cashel had never been held.' Thus there were two Churches in Ireland. Yet is the statement incorrect; for Henry did not force a Church upon the people, but a religion on the Church. But there were virtually two Churches—one (if the expression at any time be applicable), 'the Church of England in Ireland, a Roman Catholic Church within the pale, forced upon the people by the Anglo-Norman sword, a badge of England's conquest'; the other, the National Church of Ireland, outside that pale, protesting alike against England and Rome.

Notwithstanding the gradual inroads of the Anglo-Norman power, traces of their difference may be found up to the very eve of the Reformation. The conduct of the Norman invaders towards the natives, like that of their ancestors towards the Saxons, was unnatural and inhuman. Many of the English settlers had intermarried with natives, and assimilated themselves to their mode and habit of living, having adopted their language and dress. Fearful of losing their superiority if this practice became general, laws were passed making it high treason for any of the English to learn the Irish language, marry a native, wear the Irish dress, ride in Irish fashion, or stand sponsor for an Irish child. The Irish were forbidden to use their own language, and were at the same time considered as without the protection of the English laws.

Many petitions were presented by these wretched

people to the English sovereign, praying to be regarded by him as his liege subjects. But their prayer was always unsuccessful, in consequence of the opposition of the Roman Catholic priests, since the liberty to be thus enjoyed would have freed the people from the oppression of the Norman prelates. As to ecclesiastical honours, the rule was, 'No Irish need apply.' No wonder that there rose up an intense feeling of hatred to the Saxons within the breasts of the Irish people, who could not distinguish between the Saxon inhabitants of England and their Norman conquerors—hatred, be it never forgotten, not on account of Protestantism, but of political and ecclesiastical misrule, and rapacity, and injustice on the part of then Roman Catholic England, and her Roman Catholic prelates, acting, too, under the Bull of the Pope. This feeling abides to this day, though England has become Protestant, and all such oppression has ceased ; and Irish Roman Catholic priests, hating the Protestants of England, now trade upon this feeling, which their Anglo-Norman predecessors excited in the breasts of the suffering Irish people against themselves.

It is needless for my present purpose to dwell further on the state of religion from this time to the Reformation. Suffice it to say that gradually Romish power and doctrines and principles spread over the entire Church, and the natural consequences ensued—ignorance and superstition prevailed, and the Word of God was almost unknown. Instances could be specified of the treasonable conduct of the Roman Catholic priests, whenever the King's power prevailed not to keep them within bounds. Instances also of oppression, cruelty, and profligacy, so numerous and well sustained as to prove that Papacy is unsocial, inhuman and arrogant. And as Rome's own boast is that she is unchanged and unchangeable, what she was, she is, and will be until she fall to rise no more.

Thus matters continued until Henry VIII. shook off

the supremacy of the Pope, and established his own in the Church of England. He was equally desirous that it should be recognised by the Church of Ireland. In this he was seconded by three archbishops and their suffragans, and by all the princes of Ireland; but violently opposed by Cromer, Archbishop of Armagh, his suffragans, and inferior clergy. The appointment of George Browne to the archbishopric of Dublin enabled the King to carry his desires into execution. The archbishop had been previously Provincial of the Augustine Order in England, and while in that position had preached the reformed faith. After his consecration he exerted himself to the utmost of his ability to get the recognition of the King's supremacy established, but, being met by the decided opposition of the primate, he advised the King to summon a Parliament in Dublin, to have the question legally settled. Yielding to this advice, the King summoned a Parliament to assemble in Dublin, May, 1537. After considerable opposition an Act to this effect, together with others affecting the Church, was passed, one of which was highly injurious to the spread of the reformed religion. By it 'Spiritual promotions were directed to be given only to such as could speak English, unless after four proclamations in the next market town such could not be had.'

In 1542 another important Act was passed. The King of England had been permitted by the Pope to assume only the title 'Lord of Ireland'—as we have already remarked—consequently, 'Irishmen of long continuance have supposed the royal estate of this land to consist in the Bishop of Rome for the time being, and the lordship of the kingdom of England here to be but a governance under the obedience of the same, which causeth them to have more respect of due subjection unto the said bishop than to our sovereign lord.' The recognition of the supreme dominion of the King was urged upon Henry's consideration by his Irish Council, 'as a recognition to

which all the nobility and other inhabitants of the land would agree, and which would cause those of the Irishry more gladly to obey his Majesty, on account of their foolish opinion that the Bishop of Rome should be King of Ireland.' I would ask, in passing, may not this opinion be the cause of all the disaffection of Irish Roman Catholics to the British crown? A Bull of the Pope is binding on Roman Catholics to all ages; the Bull to Henry II. is part of their religious obligations to this day. Hence the Pope is toasted at their feasts before the Queen. In doing so they are only acting conscientiously up to their religion. The Act was passed to the great satisfaction of all loyal men in the kingdom. Its publication was celebrated with every demonstration of joy by the citizens of Dublin; bonfires, feasts, and religious ceremonies, the last attended by many of the nobility in their parliamentary robes, and several of the bishops and clergy of the kingdom.

One great advantage which resulted from the King's supremacy was perceptible in the appointments to vacant bishoprics, as Henry generally nominated persons favourable to the Reformation, certainly those only who refused to recognise the usurped supremacy of the Pope. But, being himself a zealous Roman Catholic, we are not astonished to find, on the death of Archbishop Cromer, George Dowdall, official to the late primate, appointed to succeed him, Dowdall being as equally zealous a Roman Catholic; yet, according to the Jesuit code of morality, consenting to recognise the King's supremacy for the purpose of securing the primacy, that he might thereby be able more successfully to advance the cause of the Pope. The Pope, however, though solicited by Dowdall, refused to recognise him, and conferred the see on Robert Wancop, a Scotchman, who was among the earliest, if not the first, of the titular bishops of Ireland. These bishops were appointed to the titles of certain sees,

though not occupying the sees, and were always ordained by foreign bishops—in no instance by the bishops of the Irish Church, the true and only successors of St. Patrick.

This radical change in the civil and ecclesiastical condition of the kingdom should not be passed by without special consideration.

Up to this time, from the days of the invasion, the Pope had been the supreme monarch of the kingdom, and head of the Church. From both these positions of authority he was now dethroned. By whom? Not by wicked English Protestants, who wanted to rob the Irish of their Church and their religion—for few and far between were the Protestants of these days—but by the Irish people themselves, all Roman Catholics; by the nation's Parliament, composed of Roman Catholic members, and summoned by a Roman Catholic lord. It was the act of Ireland herself, while yet retaining communion in religious matters with the Church of Rome, one with that Church in her creed. True, here was the dawn of the Reformation, which in due time rose in its fulness upon the land; but the work was Ireland's own, not forced upon her by the power of the sword; and were it not for subsequent mistakes, Romanism would have little hold on the Irish people at the present day. Statesmen blundered, and we are now reaping what was sown.

During the short reign of Edward VI. little was done in Ireland to advance the cause of the Reformation, while it was vigorously prosecuted in England. It is not easy to account for this remissness. A reformed Liturgy, however, both in English and Irish, was enjoined upon the people; and bishops holding the reformed faith were appointed to vacant sees.

During Mary's reign more activity was shown by the adherents of the Papacy. The Archbishop of Dublin and other Protestant bishops were deprived of their sees, the

Roman worship restored, and the Church of Ireland reduced to the state in which it was before Henry VIII. shook off the supremacy of Rome. That there was no persecution of Irish Protestants during this reign was owing to the good providence of God.

It had been determined to carry out in Ireland a similar policy to that which led so many Protestants to the stake in England. A commission was entrusted to one Dr. Coles to this effect, 'who coming with the commission to Chester, on his journey, the mayor of that city, hearing that her Majesty was sending a messenger into Ireland, and he being a churchman, waited on the doctor, who, in discoursing with the mayor, taketh out of a cloak-bag a leather box, saying unto him, "Here is a commission that shall lash the heretics of Ireland" (meaning the Protestants). The good woman of the house, being well affected to the Protestant religion, and also having a brother named John Edmonds of the same, then a citizen in Dublin, was much troubled at the doctor's words; but, watching her convenient time while the mayor took his leave, and the doctor complimented him down the stairs, she opens the box, takes the commission out, and places in lieu thereof a sheet of paper with a pack of cards wrapped up therein, the knave of clubs being faced uppermost. The doctor coming up to his chamber, suspecting nothing of what had been done, put up the box as formerly. The next day, going to the water-side, wind and weather serving him, he sails towards Ireland, and landed on October 7, 1558, at Dublin. Then coming to the castle, the Lord Fitzwalter, being Lord Deputy, sent for him to come before him and the Privy Council, who, coming in, after he had made a speech relating upon what account he came over, he presents the box unto the Lord Deputy, who causing it to be opened that the Secretary might read the commission, there was nothing save a pack of cards with the knave of

clubs uppermost, which not only startled the Lord Deputy and the Council, but the doctor, who assured them he had a commission, but knew not how it was gone. Then the Lord Deputy made answer, "Let us have another commission, and we will shuffle the cards in the meanwhile." The doctor being troubled in mind, went away and returned to England, and, coming to Court, obtained another commission; but staying for a wind on the water-side, news came to him that the Queen was dead; and thus God preserved the Protestants of Ireland.

'Queen Elizabeth was so delighted with this story, which was related to her by Lord Fitzwalter on his return to England, that she sent for Elizabeth Edmonds, whose husband's name was Mattershad, and gave her a pension of forty pounds during her life.

'This story is copied from the papers of Richard, Earl of Cork, and is to be found among the manuscripts of Sir James Ware.'

The state of things was again altered on the accession of Elizabeth to the throne, November 17, 1558. The Protestant religion was again established. An Act of Uniformity passed the Irish Parliament (January, 1560), enjoining the use of the reformed Liturgy, as used by the Church of England. This Act was not regarded as a grievance by the Roman party; on the contrary, the bishops, with the exception of two, complied with this alteration in the public worship; and the adherents of the Roman Church resorted to the parish churches, where the English service was used, during a great part, if not the whole, of Queen Elizabeth's reign.

The two recusant bishops were deprived of their sees; they had both been irregularly intruded into the two sees (Meath and Kildare) by the authority of Queen Mary, Protestant bishops having been expelled because they were married men. Now they, in their turn, were

obliged to give way to men who would preach the pure Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ. These bishops died without appointing any successors; and as all the other bishops reformed, the then Church of Rome ceased to exist in Ireland, so far as the priesthood was concerned.

An unscriptural and anti-Protestant clause in the Act of Uniformity prevented the good effects which would otherwise have resulted from the universal use of the reformed Liturgy. It was enacted that the Irish language should not be used in the churches, but that if the minister could not speak the English tongue, he should read the prayers in Latin! The effect of this provision (whether English or Latin were used was all one to the natives) was to render the people indifferent to a service they did not understand. They ceased to attend the churches, a proceeding urged upon them by Romish adherents; and in the year 1614 steps were taken to organize a new Roman Church, or rather a branch of the Roman Church, in Ireland.

In the year 1621, accordingly, we find by Philip O'Sullivan's 'Catholic History,' that there were for Ireland, appointed by the Pope, four titular archbishops, who were ordained by foreign bishops. This is the date of the origin of the present branch of the Church of Rome in Ireland. Not one bishop or priest of that Church has the orders of the Church of Ireland. Thus there are two Churches in Ireland—the new and alien Church of Rome, and the old Church of the land.

I must not pursue the history of the Church further, as we get into comparatively modern days from this date, except to say that in 1800, by act of union between Great Britain and Ireland, the two Churches of England and Ireland became 'one Protestant Episcopal Church, under the name of the United Church of England and Ireland.' The union has been since dissolved by the Irish Church Act; but neither the union nor its dissolu-

tion has effected the slightest alteration in the doctrines, discipline, or government of our Church.

The history of the Church is, I think I have indisputably proved, essentially necessary for its defence against the combined assaults of the Church of Rome and Protestant revolutionists. I trust we shall avoid giving a handle to our enemies, which they are not slow to lay hold of, by speaking of the Irish Church as 'the Church of England in Ireland,' and that we shall ever bear in mind that the badge of the English conquest of Ireland is the religion of Rome in Ireland; and further, that we shall endeavour to blot out this trace of the conquest by using our best energies to bring the members of the Church of Rome in Ireland to the knowledge of the truth as in Jesus Christ our Lord, and as held and taught by the early Irish Church.

THE END.

Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row, London.

117

220.8
C1

Campbell

AUTHOR

Studies in Biblical and

TITLE